



Ex Libris
C. K. OGDEN

3/6 note



THE LIBRARY
OF
THE UNIVERSITY
OF CALIFORNIA
LOS ANGELES

THE BOOK OF HABAKKUK

INTRODUCTION, TRANSLATION,
AND NOTES ON THE HEBREW TEXT

BY

THE REV. GEORGE G. V. STONEHOUSE, B.D.

FORMERLY SCHOLAR OF EXETER COLLEGE, OXFORD
VICE-PRINCIPAL OF THE THEOLOGICAL COLLEGE, COATES HALL, EDINBURGH

RIVINGTONS
34 *KING STREET, COVENT GARDEN*
LONDON

1911



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

BS
1633
1911

TO
THE MEMORY
OF
M. A. H.
WHO
IN HER DAYS
SHOWED NO LITTLE KINDNESS
THIS BOOK
IS
DEDICATED

1104893

P R E F A C E

THE present volume represents substantially a dissertation which was awarded in 1909 the Senior Kennicott Scholarship in the University of Oxford.

The subject of which it treats constitutes one of the most difficult problems in the Old Testament, and, as such, has engaged the increasing attention of biblical scholars. A glance at the bibliography will show how largely it has been discussed. In the following pages it has been the writer's aim, while taking into due account the different views that have been expressed, to treat it, so far as possible, independently and without reference in the first instance to what has been expressed by other writers. It is perhaps too much to hope that the view here advanced may be found to meet adequately the problems which a study of Habakkuk raises; but it is thought (and this may justify its publication) that it may help to throw fresh light

on some points of difficulty, and lead to a better understanding of this short but inspiring prophecy.

The translation, which lays no claim to elegance, is primarily intended to meet the requirements of readers unacquainted with Hebrew ; while the grammatical, philological, and textual notes which have been added will, it is hoped, be found useful by students of the original.

The author is not unmindful of how much he owes to the works of other scholars, as well as to those who have been formerly his teachers ; and in particular he wishes to express his gratitude to Professor Driver of Oxford for certain valuable suggestions, especially on points on Hebrew philology, and to Professor Witton Davies of Bangor for the encouragement and advice so freely given him not only during the production of this work, but during many years of biblical study.

G. G. V. STONEHOUSE.

THE FEAST OF THE EPIPHANY, 1911.

CONTENTS

	PAGES
I. INTRODUCTION—	
§ 1. THE PROPHET'S MESSAGE: THE CRITICAL PROBLEMS IT RAISES,	2-40
§ 2. THE DATE AND CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE PROPHECY,	40-61
§ 3. THE PERSONAL HISTORY OF THE PROPHET,	61-64
§ 4. SOME CRITICAL VIEWS ON CHAPTERS I AND 2 ¹⁻⁴ ,	65-108
§ 5. THE PRAYER OF HABAKKUK,	108-129
II. TRANSLATION,	131-145
III. NOTES ON THE HEBREW TEXT,	147-257
IV. BIBLIOGRAPHY AND INDEX,	259-264

PRINCIPAL ABBREVIATIONS EMPLOYED

<i>AJSL.</i> = American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literature.	LXX. = Septuagint Version (Swete's edition).
Aq. = Greek Version of Aquila (2nd cent. A.D.).	Mar. = K. Marti.
A.V. = Authorised Version.	M.T. = Massoretic Text (that of the ordinary pointed Hebrew Bible).
Bu. = K. Budde.	Now. = W. Nowack.
<i>Cent. Bib.</i> = Century Bible.	Old Lat. = Old Latin Version, cited from <i>Journal of Theological Studies</i> , vol. v. (Oesterley).
Dav. = A. B. Davidson.	Or. = C. von Orelli.
Dr. = S. R. Driver.	Oxf. Lex. = Brown, Driver, and Briggs, Hebrew Lexicon.
Du. = B. Duhm.	Qr. = Q ^e ri (the Hebrew Text as read).
<i>Encyc. Bib.</i> = Encyclopaedia Biblica.	Ros. = Rosenmüller.
EVV. = English Versions (A.V. and R.V.).	R.V. = Revised Version.
Ew. = H. Ewald.	R.Vm. = Margin of R.V.
G.A.S. = G. A. Smith.	<i>St. Krit.</i> = Theologische Studien und Kritiken.
Ges.-K. = Gesenius' Heb. Grammar, edit. by Kautzsch (trans. 1898).	Symm. = Greek Version of Symmachus (2nd cent. A.D.).
Gr. = H. Grätz (Emendationes, Fasc. ii.).	Syr. = Syriac Version of O.T. (prob. 2nd cent. A.D.).
<i>HDB.</i> = Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible.	Targ. = Targum.
Hitz. = F. Hitzig.	Theod. = Greek Version of Theodotion (2nd cent. A.D.).
Hoon. = A. van Hoonacker.	Vulg. = Vulgate.
<i>Inter. Comm.</i> = International Critical Commentary.	We. = J. Wellhausen.
Ke. = C. F. Keil.	<i>ZATW.</i> = Zeitschrift f. alttestamentl. Wissenschaft.
Kit. <i>Bib.</i> = R. Kittel's <i>Biblia Hebraica</i> .	ג' וגומר = <i>et cætera</i> .
Kön. = E. König (Lehrgebäude der hebr. Sprache, i.).	
Kt. = K ^e thiv (the Hebrew Text as written).	

INTRODUCTION

IN comparatively recent years the study of the book of Habakkuk has commanded increased interest ; this is largely due to the fact that the time has now gone by when it was felt that the prophecy offered no special difficulty, and when it was thought that the date of its composition and the subject with which it deals were both easily ascertainable. With the rise of historical criticism new interest was aroused in the writing of the prophet, for it was not only discovered, when the same keen and critical tests were applied to it as to the rest of Biblical Literature, that it was not free from difficulty, but the difficulties were seen to be such as to give it a place among the most vexed questions which the study of the Old Testament offers. In fact, far from making any confident assertion as to the precise content and structure of the book, and in view of the variety of interpretations which have been advanced especially in recent times, one can scarcely at the present time do more than state the difficulties which the book raises, test the

explanations which have been suggested for their solution, and endeavour with the data at hand to point out what would appear to be a probable conclusion.

A natural order would be to begin with the person of the prophet, and then consider the nature of his prophecy and the circumstances of the period in which he lived. But in view of the little definite information we have respecting the prophet and the difficulties which his message raises, it would on the whole appear better to follow a different arrangement. We shall first consider his message and its critical problems; next, the circumstances of the period, the date of the prophecy and the person of the prophet. This will be followed by a discussion of the chief critical views that have been put forward in view of the difficulties raised in chs. 1 and 2. And then, lastly, we shall consider the Psalm in ch. 3, which by its special title is marked off from the rest of the book, and is therefore best considered apart from the preceding chapters.

§ 1. THE PROPHET'S MESSAGE: THE CRITICAL PROBLEMS IT RAISES.

*The Contents
of Chs 1 and
2.*

The book opens with an expostulation. The prophet expostulates with Jehovah for His apparent indifference to the violence and evil which he is having to witness, and to the growing spirit of discord

and strife. In consequence of the prevalency of wickedness the *Torah* is being rendered ineffectual and *right* perverted (1²⁴). Apparently the prophet and those whose sentiments he voices are then bidden by Jehovah to look among the nations around, for He is about to do a work which is as astonishing as it is incredible; He is on the point of raising up the Chaldean, that fierce and impetuous people (vv. ⁵, ^{6a}). A description of the Chaldean follows. They are a people who are marching on through the breadth of the land, possessing themselves of dwellings to which they have no right; who recognise no authority except their own, whose swiftness more than equals the proverbial swiftness of the leopard, and whose fierceness more than that of the evening wolf. Their horsemen come from afar, as eager as a vulture is for food. Their only object is violence; they take captives, mock at kings and princes, capture fortresses, and in this they recognise no Higher Power than their own prowess (vv. ^{6b-11}). In the next and following verses the prophet, while expressing his sense of assurance in Jehovah, is perplexed by His apparent indifference to the outrages which are being perpetrated. It is for judgment, doubtless, that they (*i.e.* the Chaldean) have been appointed, but why should Jehovah being what He is, pure and holy, countenance a treacherous foe, who are dragging men—more righteous than themselves—into nets like fishes, and who, elated by their success,

merely deify their own might. Will they thus, the prophet asks, be permitted to destroy nations and spare not? (vv. ¹²⁻¹⁷). Ch. 2 opens with a picture of the prophet standing on his outlook, and waiting for some answer to his complaint, which Jehovah at length gives him. He is bidden to inscribe the vision, which he has received, on tablets so that all may read; for it contains a message, the fulfilment of which lies still in the future (vv. ¹⁻³). The purport of this vision is that, while their (Heb. 'his,' *i.e.* presumably the Chaldean's) soul is puffed up, the righteous by their (Heb. 'his') steadfastness shall live (v. ⁴); to which is added in v. ⁵ (the text of which is evidently in some disorder) a reference to the treachery and insatiability which they (*i.e.* the Chaldean) have shown in their attitude towards other peoples, and which in the end will encompass their ruin (vv. ^{4, 5}). In the succeeding verses the peoples who have been the victims of outrage are represented as taking up a taunt-song against their former conquerors, and taunting them with the fact that the same treatment has befallen them as they have been meting out to others. The taunt-song is divided into five parts, each of which is introduced by יהי; and it alludes to the spoliation, violent rapacity, cruel oppression and savage treatment of which the Chaldeans have been guilty, as well as to the idolatry which has served them to no purpose (vv. ⁶⁻¹⁹).

¹ Comp. p. 35.

With this series of 'woes' the prophet concludes his message; the following psalm (ch. 3) which is traditionally assigned to him is, for reasons which will be stated later, most probably no original part of his prophecy.

The above sketch will make sufficiently clear the nature and the contents of the book, and it would not be difficult to construct, at least roughly, some connection in thought between the different sections into which we have divided these chapters. Thus the violence and lawlessness, of which the prophet complains in 1²⁻⁴, might be understood to relate to what is happening *within* Judah, and be explained as referring to the attitude of the ungodly towards the righteous. In this case it would be natural to see in vv. 5, 6a an answer to the prophet's complaint; Jehovah announces His intention of raising up as His instrument of punishment the Chaldeans, who are then more fully described in the following verses (vv. 6b-11). We might suppose, further, that this answer, instead of relieving the prophet's perplexity, tended only to raise a fresh difficulty in his mind. As the prophet looks on the inhumanity of the Chaldeans, their utter impiety and contemptuous treatment of the peoples, the latter seem to him to be far less deserving of punishment than the Chaldeans themselves. The thought of this fills him with despair; he wonders how it is that the Righteous Ruler should countenance such flagrant wrongs, even

Usual interpretation stated.

though they have been raised up as an instrument of judgment (vv. 12-17). 2¹⁻⁵ would then be the answer to this difficulty. Jehovah assures him that the righteous will live by virtue of his steadfastness and integrity of life, while the Chaldean is elated with pride. The answer, which expresses a moral distinction, implies the destruction of the Chaldean, which is then depicted in the form of a taunt-song (vv. 6-19). This would appear to be an obvious interpretation, and it is as a matter of fact the one which has been most commonly accepted. But when we consider it more closely it soon becomes evident that it is not so obvious as it would appear. We become conscious of serious difficulties which are frankly admitted by those scholars who are inclined, at least provisionally, to accept it. We notice, firstly, that the terms in which the Chaldeans are announced as the divine instrument of judgment seem inconsistent with the situation implied in the rest of the book. In 1⁵ and 1⁶ the intervention of the Chaldeans is viewed as still *in the future*, as an act which is about to be fulfilled and which will be received *with surprise and incredulity*. This would clearly imply that their advent, at least so far as Judah is concerned, also lies as yet in the future; whereas the description which follows (in 1¹⁴⁻¹⁷ at any rate) as well as the pointed references to them in the taunt-song (2⁶⁻¹⁹) would naturally indicate that their character was already well known, and that

Difficulties involved in this interpretation.

Judah, even if it had not yet *actually experienced* their violence, was evidently in close touch with them (cf. 2¹⁷), so that a still closer contact might not unreasonably be expected (note especially 1¹⁷ which seems to imply this). And, secondly, the main aim of the book is admittedly to point out the coming downfall of the Chaldeans. The prophet reflects on the violence and merciless treatment which the Chaldeans are showing the peoples who fall under their power, and appeals to Jehovah to know why it is that such treatment has simply been rewarded hitherto by further success. His appeal is answered in a manner which predicts the ultimate ruin of the Chaldean power, and which calls forth from the prophet a taunt-song, in which their outrage and other abuses are pithily mentioned. If this, as seems clear, is the intention of the writer, why should he, it may naturally be asked, go out of his way to mention the sins of Judah and announce, as their judgment, the invasion of the Chaldeans? There seems to be no obvious reason why he should have devoted the first few verses to predicting the rise of the Chaldean in judgment on Judah, when in the rest of his message he will spare no word in denouncing the same people whose cruelty and outrages demand, apparently even more than Judah's sins, the judgment of God. And, thirdly, it has been rightly urged¹ that we should naturally expect the complaint, with which the

¹ Comp. Giesebrecht, *Beiträge zur Jesaiakritik*, p. 197.

prophet opens his book and thus renders prominent, to be of the same nature as that to which the greater part of the chapter is assigned and which receives Jehovah's answer in 2¹⁻⁴. On the above interpretation, however, this is not the case, and it is necessary as we see to distinguish two remonstrances.

Two suggested explanations.

To obviate these difficulties various explanations have been proposed by those who adhere to the present text. Thus the late Prof. Davidson, following Kuenen, understood 1¹⁻¹¹ as preliminary to the main subject of the book, namely the downfall of the Chaldean, and regarded 1⁵⁻¹¹ not as 'a prophecy of the raising up of the Chaldeans *except in form*.'¹ The passage is 'a reference to the past, an explanation merely of their presence and meaning as instruments of Jehovah,' which has been cast by the prophet into 'the dramatic form of a dialogue between himself and Jehovah.'¹ This explanation, as the writer himself admits,² is very artificial. To regard the prophet's appeal, which reads so intense and real, only as a method of stating Judah's sinfulness and the prediction of the rise of the Chaldean only as a method of stating its punishment is, at the least, very strained and unnatural. In fact, if this were the only object the prophet had in view, it would seem to be sufficiently stated in 1¹², where he expresses his assurance that it is 'for judgment' and 'to reprove' that

¹ *Camb. Bib.* p. 48. The italics are the present writer's.

² *Id.* pp. 49, 50.

Jehovah has appointed the Chaldean. Another explanation¹ is that 1²⁻⁴ and 1⁵⁻¹¹ were actually written by the prophet at an earlier date, when he first realised that the Chaldeans had been appointed for the punishment of Judah's sins; while 1^{12ff} were added later, after he had become conscious of the true character of that power. This explanation would give 1²⁻¹¹ a natural import, and is an improvement on the one which we have just considered. Yet it can scarcely be regarded as an altogether satisfactory explanation; for on this view we should miss any formal indication in the text that the prophet intended the chapter to be regarded as two distinct utterances; while there are further difficulties, as we shall see immediately, which neither this explanation nor that of Davidson would adequately meet.

Other suggestions,² more or less plausible, have been made, but in reality these suggested explanations only tend to throw into relief the difficulty of the problem. Moreover, apart from the main objections which have been raised above in connection with the usual interpretation of the passage, there are other difficulties which are scarcely of less importance. We may leave out of consideration the suggestion that, on the above view of ch. 1, we should have to distinguish between the רשע of 1⁴ Further difficulties suggested by 1⁵⁻¹¹

¹ Cf. Driver, *HDB*, vol. ii, pp. 269 ff. and *Cent. Bib.* p. 57.

Comp. König, *Einleitung*, p. 349; Boehmer in the *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift* (1899); and further *Cent. Bib.* p. 57.

and the רשע of 1¹³—a point which was first raised by Giesebrecht¹—for it is far from certain whether רשע represents in 1⁴ the original punctuation (cf. *Notes on Hebrew Text*, pp. 161 ff.), and we may confine our attention to 1⁵⁻¹¹. Now on the usual interpretation vv. 5^{ff} are understood to introduce the answer to the prophet's appeal in 1²⁻⁴; but is it not somewhat strange, especially when we compare the impressive manner in which the answer is given in 2^{1ff}, to find that in the passage in question no such clear indication is given, but on the contrary the reader is simply allowed to *infer it* for himself? The appeal in 1²⁻⁴ is equally intense and real as in 1^{12ff}, and we should expect, therefore, the answer to have been made just as prominent in 1⁵ as in 2^{1ff}.² Again in 1⁵⁻¹¹ we miss *any direct reference* to Judah; this is certainly difficult to account for if, as is generally assumed, the passage refers primarily to judgment on Judah's sins. We should have expected at the least 'Behold I am raising up *against you*' or '*against them*' instead of the simple 'Behold I am raising up.' Not only do we not find this, *but the Chaldeans are expressly spoken of as coming for violence*, the very thing which, on the

¹ *Beiträge z. Jesaikritik*, pp. 196 ff.

² It may also be noted that in view of the fact that in 1²⁻⁴ the singular is used throughout we might not unnaturally have expected the answer to have been addressed *in the singular* to the prophet exactly as in 2² rather than *in the plural*, which must be taken to mean the prophet and his countrymen, unless the reading בונרים as in LXX. and Syr. is to be adopted, which, however, would not lessen the difficulty.

above supposition, they have been raised up to punish. No doubt an act of judgment might also from one point of view be regarded as an act of violence, but, in view of his remonstrance in 1², the prophet would almost certainly have avoided using this phrase; or if he had intended to say Israel's violence would be met by a corresponding act of violence he would surely have expressed himself differently and made this quite clear to his readers. Moreover, there are certain phrases in 1⁵⁻¹¹ which are at least uncalled for in a passage which is supposed to have as its object the representation of the Chaldeans as Jehovah's instrument of judgment. For instance in v. 7 *יָצָא מִשְׁפָּטוֹ וְיִצְחָקוֹ*, 'their right and their dignity proceed from themselves,' stress is laid on the Chaldeans' imperiousness; they acknowledge no other right but their own. Similarly in v. 11 it is expressly stated that they recognise no Higher Power but their own might as the source of their success. These representations, it must be owned, are not such as would have naturally suggested themselves to the prophet had it been his desire to portray the Chaldean as executing Jehovah's judgment on Judah and going forth at His command.¹ Again in v. 6 the idea of 'possessing habitations to which they have no right' (notice the emphasis *לֹא לָם*) is somewhat unnatural, if the Chaldeans are sup-

¹ Cf. Is. 10^{34f}, where the prophet attributes a similar attitude to the Assyrian, but *as a reason for their fall*.

posed to be the divinely appointed instrument for accomplishing that judgment which the peoples and Judah in particular are understood to have merited.

*The real crux
of chs. 1-2^{1ff.}*

Such points of difficulty, together with those that have been mentioned above,¹ if they do not inevitably lead to the conclusion, at any rate seem best explained on the supposition that *verses 5, 6a, which announce the Chaldeans as if they were being raised up for judgment, are out of place.* They neither agree with the character of the description that follows, nor do they suit the description which is implied in by far the larger portion of the prophet's message, nor does the form in which they are cast suggest that they were originally intended as an answer to the complaint raised in 1²⁻⁴. This is what we believe to be the real *crux* of ch. 1, and not, as has generally been inferred, the whole section 1⁵⁻¹¹. In their present form these verses (5, 6a) cannot be original and they must accordingly be discarded.

In this case two questions arise: (*a*) if the prediction of the Chaldean invasion is not in place, what shall we say with regard to 1^{6b-11}? Are these verses in their proper context? And (*b*) what view, in consequence, must be adopted with regard to 1²⁻⁴? Is it clear that these verses refer *simply* to internal troubles? To these questions we must now direct our attention.

The first question resolves itself into an inquiry

¹ Comp. pp. 6 ff.

as to the precise relation in which I^{6b-11} stand to I^{12-17} . Are they inconsistent, we may ask, with the terms of the prophet's remonstrance in the latter section? Dismissing from our mind the thought that I^{6b-11} are intended as a description of the Chaldean who are about to be raised up in judgment on Judah's sins, and considering them *only* in connection with I^{12-17} it may be said at once that there is nothing in their description of the advancing Chaldean which is inconsistent with the latter verses; not only is this the case but the present text of I^{12ff} strongly presupposes some previous reference to an invading foe. v. ¹² makes this clear. Here the prophet interprets the danger which is threatening his people as an act of judgment from Jehovah. The following verses, no less than the clause, v. ^{12b}, show that this danger is such as is experienced at the hand of a foe; who this foe is, that is referred to, is most naturally seen in the הַנִּי described in the preceding verses; and with this the singular suffix, which is maintained throughout the description, agrees. Again in vv. ^{14ff} we have a description of the outrage which this foe is committing on humanity and of the success which is everywhere attending its advance. This does not definitely require that other details should have already been given, but the manner in which it is introduced would tend to favour this. The description, moreover, suits very well the picture sketched

The description in I^{6b-11} not inconsistent with I^{12-17} .

in I^{6b-11} ; we notice, for instance, (*a*) that the ease with which it vanquishes men and the treatment which it shows towards them agree closely with what is told us in vv. 8^{10} ; (*b*) that the statement that it deifies its weapons finds a near parallel in v. 11 ; and (*c*) that both in vv. $6b-11$ and in vv. $14-17$ it is referred to throughout in the singular; while the form בָּלָה is found both in v. 9 and v. 15 ; this latter feature, however, might of course be purely accidental. While there is nothing, then, in the description of I^{6b-11} which is inconsistent with I^{12-17} , there are not a few features in the latter verses, as we see, which presuppose the former section, and favour the present arrangement of the text. Accordingly we are inclined to conclude that, unless evidence is forthcoming which outweighs the above considerations, we have no good reason for discarding vv. $6b-11$ or discrediting their position before vv. $12-17$.

*The question
of I^{2-4} .*

Admitting, then, I^{6b-17} to be an integral part of the prophecy, what shall we say respecting the *interpretation* of I^{2-4} and their connection with these verses? This is our second question (*b*), and it is a more difficult one to decide because it is exactly here that the opinion of scholars is divided; some hold that these verses speak of domestic wrongs within the nation, others maintain, with perhaps equal force, that the prophet is, on the contrary, speaking of wrongs perpetrated by some external foe. And this latter view is held not only by those scholars

who advocate a rearrangement of the text but also by those who would adhere to its present order.

Now it must be admitted that vv.²⁴ lead us, at least on a first consideration, most naturally to think of such wrongs and acts of outrage as were happening *within* Judah, and which the prophet was then experiencing. There are several indications which would point in this direction. It has, for instance, been pointed out that : (1) the manner in which all the ancient prophets complain of internal wrong and injustice in Israel suggests that the same is the case here ; (2) the mention of 'strife and contention' seems to indicate 'animosities between members of the same community rather than injuries inflicted on a subject people by their conquerors'¹ ; (3) the earnestness with which the prophet urges his plea and the interest that he shows suggest that he is complaining 'not only of injuries which he sees around him, but which he himself suffers'² ; and (4) that it is difficult to regard the slack *Torah* and perverted judgment naturally as the effects of foreign tyranny.³ The view that ¹²⁻¹ refers to domestic wrongs dis-cussed and rejected.

These indications are forcible and, were it not for the difficulty which this interpretation raises, it would be hard to resist the conclusion that the prophet in this passage is actually speaking of wrongs which he is witnessing within Judah. The difficulty, of which we speak, relates to the connection of these verses with the rest of the prophet's message ; for it is not easy to

¹ Dav. *Camb. Bib.* p. 66. ² *Id.* p. 65. ³ Dr. Cent. *Bib.* p. 56.

see why on the above view the prophet, without any real indication that he is doing so, should suddenly transfer his attention from the social wrongs which were harassing the righteous to the wrongs and outrage which the Chaldean conquerors were perpetrating on the peoples in general; why at the beginning of his message he should give prominence and emphasis to a complaint about the domestic relations of his people, when he is going to devote much the larger part of that message to the harsh treatment which the neighbouring peoples are experiencing, and when he is intending also to appeal with equal, if not with greater, force for Jehovah's intervention on their behalf. It is an inconsistency which it would be difficult to solve, and it is not surprising, therefore, that another interpretation has been advanced.

The view that these verses refer to the tyranny shown by a foe towards Judah is likewise to be rejected.

It may be said that there is a growing tendency now to regard these verses not as describing internal wrongs, such as practised by the ungodly within Israel, but as describing the tyranny which a heathen foe—presumably the Chaldean—is exercising over Judah. This explanation rests mainly on two grounds. It is pointed out (1) that it is not natural to distinguish the רשע ('wicked') of v. ⁴ from the רשע of v. ¹³; and as רשע in v. ¹³ refers to the invading foe, רשע in v. ⁴ will accordingly have a similar reference; and (2) that it is reasonable (comp. what has just been urged) to think that the

prophet's complaint is the same in vv. ²⁻⁴ as in vv. ¹²⁻¹⁷.

We shall have occasion later to refer more particularly to this view and the theories connected with it (cf. *Critical views on chs. 1. and 2*); it is only necessary now to point out the main objection which would seem to stand in the way of this interpretation. If Judah is actually experiencing the tyranny of a foreign foe, and these verses are directly connected with vv. ¹²⁻¹⁷, it seems strange that in this latter passage the prophet does not *apparently* dwell, as we should expect, on the sufferings of his fellow-countrymen, but only on those of the nations. A reference to them might perhaps be seen in v. ^{13b}, but this—unless with the LXX. צַדִּיק ('righteous') simply is to be read—looks as if it has been purposely excluded by the addition of מִמֶּנּוּ ('more . . . than he'). Moreover those who adopt this explanation generally agree that 1⁵⁻¹¹ are out of place, and would transfer the section from its present context and place it before 1², or else after the prophet's revelation in 2⁴; whereas we have seen good reasons for believing that these verses—at least vv. ^{6b-11}—are closely connected with what follows, and, accordingly, give little or no evidence that they are not in their original place in the prophecy. Either of these explanations, it will be seen, then involves some difficulty; and we are compelled to inquire whether some other interpretation may not still be offered so

that these verses may be brought, without violence to the meaning of their terms or any straining of the natural sense of the passage, into connection with the rest of the chapter (*i.e.* with vv. ^{6b} ff); otherwise it will be difficult to resist the conclusion that the passage is out of place, and its true explanation must be sought for outside the circumstances of the original prophecy as presented in 1^{6b}-2^{1ff}.¹

The true interpretation of 1²⁻⁴. The wrongs referred to are such as are perpetrated on the peoples.

Now, as we have already hinted above, it is natural to expect that these verses, if they stand in any real and obvious connection with the rest of the chapter (excluding of course vv. ⁵, ^{6a}), will in some way or other reflect the same situation and deal with the same subject as the prophet depicts in the main portion of his message; in other words, we are led to conclude that the violence and outrage of which the prophet complains in vv. ²⁻⁴ will be the same as are referred to in vv. ^{13ff} the nature and source of which are more particularly given in vv. ^{6b-11}. In these latter sections the reference we have seen is clearly to the peoples; at any rate there is no *explicit* reference to Judah. Accordingly, the violence and destruction of which he speaks in vv. ²⁻⁴ will be *such as he sees perpetrated on the neighbouring peoples and not such*

¹ In this case it may be due to a later editor, who, by way of adapting to the history of his own people a prophecy which originally concerned the Chaldean's outrage on the neighbouring peoples and their coming judgment, inserted this passage as an introduction. If this is so, it might well be a fragment of some older, though no longer extant, prophecy. This view, however, as we shall see, is quite unnecessary.

as are immediately directed against his own countrymen. Now there would not appear to be anything which would forbid our accepting this conclusion ; even if, on the other hand, there is nothing in the *passage itself* which would *directly* suggest it. The terms which the prophet uses in v.² and in v.³ are not unsuitable ; nor can it be fairly urged against such an interpretation that the phraseology is similar to that which is usually employed with reference to Israel, and therefore requires that it should be understood similarly in the present passage ; for, quite apart from the fact that our knowledge of the circumstances of the period is really very scanty, and, consequently, forbids our forming any *a priori* conception of the background of events, it is precarious to place too much stress on literary usage, even if it here (which is not the case) seemed only to authorise a reference to Judah. In saying this, however, it is not intended to underrate the value of literary usage ; each word should be duly weighed, its meaning elucidated, and use specified ; but when, as here, the words are general terms, they can only at the most *create a presumption in favour of* such and such an interpretation, and should not be so pressed as to exclude the possibility of their being used otherwise than in their more ordinary connection. In the present instance the terms used would be quite as applicable to a description of outrages which were being committed on the nations as to a description of what was being per-

*An objection
raised and
answered.*

petrated against or in Judah. But perhaps it may be objected that this view would imply that the prophet did not participate in the experiences of which he speaks, whereas his appeal to Jehovah is at once so real and importune, and his complaint so earnest and direct that it would be difficult to think that he did not fully share in the consequences of the affairs in question. The verses certainly give the impression that the prophet is alluding to experiences with which he himself is intimately concerned and, unless his words are completely to be emptied of their force and meaning, the impression is such as cannot well be doubted. But it is more than questionable whether this can rightly be urged as an objection against the above interpretation. For quite apart from the fact that this view does not necessarily, as we shall presently see, exclude on the prophet's part a lively interest and share in the events at issue, it would be sufficient to point out that in vv. ^{6b-11} and vv. ^{12ff} the prophet's thoughts for the most part, if not wholly, centre on the outrage which is being committed on the nations and that the expressions there are just as real and earnest as they are in the present passage. But this ring of reality in the prophet's words which, as we see, is true not only of v. ² and v. ³ but also of vv. ^{6b-17} does call for some explanation. If, as we may presume, the prophet is a Judean, how is it that he should manifest so lively an interest in the circumstances which are befalling

other peoples? An explanation seems to suggest itself in v. ⁴; in this verse the prophet speaks of the 'paralysed' state of the *Torah*, and laments the fact that 'right will never go forth.' If, as is evidently intended, this state of things is directly traceable to the presence of violence referred to in the previous verses, then we are more than justified in accounting for the concern and anxiety which the prophet manifests as mainly due to the bad and weakening effect which this evil is having on the *Torah*. But in this case how can the carrying out of the *Torah* be thought of as directly influenced by evils which have arisen not *within but outside* Judah? In order to answer this question it will be necessary to examine the meaning of the terms of v. ⁴ and indicate the relation in which they stand to v. ² and v. ³.

Prophet's concern due to bad effect external affairs are having on the Torah.

Now there can be no doubt that v. ⁴ with its reference to the *Torah* and *Mišpat* has largely influenced the interpretation of the preceding verses; perhaps more than anything else it has led to the suggestion that these verses must primarily refer to wrongs within Judah. It has been usual to understand *Torah* as referring to the moral directions given by the priest and prophet and *Mišpat* 'right' to the 'decision' of the judge; or else to understand both terms more generally as denoting the moral and social law of the community.¹ On either inter-

¹ Comp. Dav. *Camb. Bib.* p. 67. Or even to the embodiment of moral and social law in the book of Deuteronomy, cf. Budde, *Encyc.*

pretation, it would be but natural to suppose that the prophet was thinking of flagrant social and moral wrongs within the state and to explain the passage accordingly.¹ But the meaning of the terms *Torah* and *Mišpat* is not so certain as commentators would have us suppose. The term *Torah* is a general term, meaning 'direction,' and since it is applicable in more ways than one, the nature of the 'direction' must be judged from the context, or if the latter is ambiguous and uncertain, it must be conjectured from what would appear to be the probable character of the circumstances to which reference is made. Thus it may denote, for instance, the teaching or direction which a prophet gives in view of the moral and social life of the community or as to the true character of religious service; or it may be used of the special direction which a priest gives on some particular question ceremonial or otherwise. But over and above such uses *Torah* was also employed to denote *the authoritative pronouncement which a prophet gave in Jehovah's name in the matter of affairs connected with the state*; in other words it was used

*Interpretation
of the term
Torah.*

Bib. col. 1924. Those who regard these verses as referring to wrongs which are being immediately directed against Judah usually understand תורה and מִשְׁפָּט as terms for the 'true religion,' for which Is. 42^{1, 4} 51¹, etc., are quoted, cf. We. *Kl. Proph.* p. 161.

¹ An objection, however, may be raised against this view on the ground that it would presuppose a different usage of לֹנְנָה (R.V. 'never'), for, as Davidson remarks, elsewhere לֹנְנָה is not found in the sense of 'on no occasion' but always refers to the future, comp. *Camb. Bib.* p. 67.

of 'political direction' or 'policy.' We find it used in this sense in Is. 8¹⁶ where the prophet directs that 'the testimony' should be bound up and the *Torah* or 'direction' sealed among his disciples; and again in v. ²⁰, where the only safety of the people is said to lie in their seeking the *Torah* and 'the testimony.' What this 'direction' is, to which reference is made, is sufficiently clear from the context. It was the rejected advice or teaching given at the time of the Syro-Ephraimite invasion; or in other words the duty on Judah's part of trusting steadfastly on Jehovah instead of seeking an alliance with Assyria. In Is. 30⁹ we find again a similar use of the term; here the prophet describes his fellow-countrymen as 'a rebellious people, lying children, children that will not hear the *Torah* of Jehovah.' What the '*Torah* of Jehovah' is that they have rejected is seen from v. ⁷ and the preceding passage, according to which they are said to have put their reliance on Egypt and meditated revolt instead of yielding themselves unreservedly to the Divine Will and submitting to Assyrian supremacy, as Isaiah directed them. These passages will sufficiently illustrate the 'political' use of the term *Torah*; and, in view of this use and the illustration which these chapters in Isaiah afford, it becomes a matter of interest as to whether the term *Torah* may not be similarly employed in the present passage. It would be no argument against this interpretation

of the term, that there is nothing in the context which would definitely suggest it; for the same might be said of any one interpretation that has been placed on the word. In favour, however, of this explanation it may be pointed out that the expressions 'is numbed or cold' and 'will not go out' at least *create the impression* that the prophet is speaking of some definite policy rather than the maintenance of the moral or social law or the performance of priestly or juridical duties.¹ On the whole, then, we are inclined to believe that the *Torah*, of which the prophet speaks, is what he as a true prophet of Jehovah taught and directed to be followed in the affairs of the state, in a word the *religious-political policy* advocated by him and those like-minded with him. In this case מִשְׁפָּט 'right' will be synonymous and, while meaning literally 'that which is judged to be right,' may be rendered here 'right course of action.'

The term equivalent to 'policy'; and Mišpat to 'right course of action.'

The meaning of the term 'wickedness' (M.T. 'wicked').

Accepting, accordingly, this explanation of the terms *Torah* and *Mišpat*, we may now consider the second part of this verse (v. 4^b), and see the relation in which it stands to the leading idea expressed in the first part (cl. *a*). Clause *b*^a כִּי רִשָּׁע מִכְתִּיר אֶת-הַצְּדִיק ('For wickedness [M.T. 'wicked'] beleaguers the righteous'), it will be noticed, states the reason why

¹ It may be noticed, also, that this interpretation of the term *Torah* would permit of לִנְצַח being used in the usual sense of 'never.' Comp. note, p. 22.

the prophet despairs of 'right' ever going forth. But what does he exactly mean by רשע מכתיר? את-הוצדיק? Here again, the meaning of the clause will depend on a right understanding of a term, viz. רשע. And in this connection it is necessary to point out, though the case in point does not perhaps materially affect the issue of the question, that there are good reasons (see *Notes on Hebrew Text*, pp. 161ff.) for believing that what the prophet intended was not רשע (as in M.T.) but רשע. Adopting then this punctuation, does רשע describe the wickedness which is prevalent in Israel or that which is being perpetrated by the advancing foe and which is described in greater detail in the following verses, or is it the case that it is used with neither of these significations but is intended rather to have a more special application? What has been said above with reference to the terms *Torah* and *Mišpat* will lead us to expect that רשע ('wickedness') will also in some way be closely associated in meaning with those terms and therefore be used in other than its general sense of 'wickedness,' whether as practised by Judah itself or such as was being perpetrated by the foe. Now, whatever be the exact date to which we may be inclined to assign the prophecy, there was one principle which was fundamental to prophetic teaching. It was the principle of 'simple trust' in Jehovah, and the discountenancing

of foreign interference. And any infringement of this principle, so essential to the maintenance of a right conception of Jehovah, could only be regarded by the prophet as an act of רשע 'wickedness.' Such an application of the term we find in Hos. 10¹³: 'Ye have plowed *wickedness*, ye have reaped iniquity, ye have eaten the fruit of lies; for thou didst trust in thy way, in the multitude of thy mighty men. Therefore (v. ¹⁴) shall a tumult arise, etc.' (R.V.); here the term רשע evidently indicates, in the prophet's thoughts, something more than what is ordinarily understood by 'wickedness.' Not only are the expressions 'ploughed' and 'reaped' strongly suggestive of some definite line of action, but the following clause 'for thou didst trust in thy way, etc.,' whether it be taken with what immediately precedes or follows, shows clearly that the prophet had in mind some political scheme or other which was directly adverse to the fundamental position of the religious life of the nation. What the nature of that scheme was, is seen from 12¹; it was the policy of reliance on Egypt, or possibly alliance with Assyria. Now it is just such an attitude on the part of the nation and its leaders, as Hoshea refers to under this term, that might well be spoken of here as subversive of the *Torah*. It would, as we see, strike at the very root of prophetic teaching. So long as the nation ceased to acknowledge fully the all-sovereignty of Jehovah and involved itself in political intrigue or sought

foreign help there could be no hope of it ever realising, or even approaching, that ideal which the prophets held out in their *Torah* and which had for its fundamental conception the intimate relationship in which Jehovah stood to His people. That such was actually the position to which the prophet is alluding in the present passage would seem to be further indicated by the reference to 'strife' and 'contention' in 1²; for it is not unnatural to see in these words an allusion to the friction and strife caused by contending parties, who, advocating some one policy or other, were directly hindering the work of those who were endeavouring to assert the claim of the *Torah*. We are inclined therefore to conclude that what the prophet had in mind when he wrote *כִּי רָשָׁע מִכְתִּיר אֶת־הַצְדִּיק* was not the wickedness, which the foe was perpetrating, nor such acts of evil and wrong as might have been prevalent among the Judean people, but those policies, for instance, of intrigue or reliance on foreign help, which the leading factions in Judah were endeavouring to set on foot in view of the oncoming foe, and which, as opposed to the *authoritative direction* which he and his associates put forward in Jehovah's name, could only be termed *רָשָׁע* 'wickedness.' On this view, then, the verse as a whole will refer to the gloomy prospect which circumstances at that time held out to the righteous in their endeavour to carry through that course of action to which they were pledged by the

authoritative teaching of the prophets. Jehovah's apparent indifference to wrong and the presence of party strife and contention among the people had a paralysing effect on the *Torah*, so much so, that the righteous despaired of right action ever succeeding, because, however much they tried to enforce it, they were continually met by some counter policy. Such 'wickedness' as this, said the prophet, 'beleaguered' them, 'and therefore *Mišpat* or right action went out'—not straight but—'crooked.' Instead of its being adopted and followed as was hoped and wished for, it was *bent away* from its course; it was foiled in its purpose.

Conclusion. We are now able to understand why the prophet should have expressed so much concern. It was due, as we see, to the spirit of opposition which was then manifesting itself among his people towards the divine *Torah* and which was directly traceable to the evils which were being perpetrated by the Chaldeans. The Chaldeans were not only assuming a threatening attitude and striking terror into the heart of his countrymen, but the continuance of hostility and the rapid advance they were making were leading to strife and discord within the state with the result that the *Torah* or authoritative policy of Jehovah's prophets was being disregarded and the leaders of the people were having recourse to measures which were detrimental to the true welfare of the nation.

It is no objection to the above interpretation of vv.²⁻⁴ that while v.² and v.⁴ will refer respectively to events outside and within the state, v.³ will refer partly to one and partly to the other;¹ for, though the text of this latter verse is not at all certain, all that the prophet would seem to intend is to state in a terse, summary way the *scene* of trouble and mischief on which he looks, and which is filling not only his own country but the land throughout with consternation and alarm.

There would appear to be, then, no sufficient reason for doubting the present position of I²⁻⁴ and their connection with I^{6b ff}; as thus understood, both passages will be concerned with the presence of a threatening foe, and in both the prophet will directly address Jehovah. What follows, however, in I^{5, 6a} is inconsistent with the present connection, and we have already concluded that these verses, at least in their present form, are out of place. But it is equally apparent that v.^{6b} did not follow immediately vv.²⁻⁴; for, among other reasons, we expect at least some verse which will take up again the subject of v.² and v.^{3a} after the prophet's reference in v.^{3b} and v.⁴ to the effect which events are having on the *Torah*; while the terms of v.^{6b} would

¹ To state it more precisely, the 'trouble' and 'mischief,' the 'spoliation' and 'violence,' of which the prophet speaks in this verse, will refer, as in v.², to the action of the Chaldean; while 'strife and contention' will refer more particularly, as we have seen, to what is happening within the community.

lead us also to expect that a definite reference has been made as to who the foe is that is contemplated.

Now there would not seem to be any good reason for doubting the accuracy of tradition that the foe described by the prophet is actually the Chaldean. The description throughout would suit quite well the character of that people. So much seems clear. What, however, is more doubtful is whether vv. ⁵, ^{6a} are really *replacing* the original text or whether, on the other hand, the original text *forms the basis* of the present M.T. and has simply been *worked over* by the editor. The former view would be quite possible, and, as a matter of fact, v. ⁵ has been regarded as an editorial insertion by some scholars, notably by Budde and Rothstein; but on the whole it would seem somewhat better to suppose that the editor is really not *replacing* but *transforming* the original text, in order to bring it into conformity with the purpose he had in view. That this is the case appears to be indicated by the combination **והביטו . . . ראו**, which in view of v. ³ and v. ¹³ strongly suggests, in some form or other, a trace of the original text; and also by the consideration that an editor would more probably have adjusted an existing text than have simply replaced it by an insertion of his own. As to the original text the only point which may be asserted with confidence is that it must have been *in the form of an address to Jehovah*; for, as we have seen, not only vv. ²⁻⁴ but vv. ^{6b} ff are

to be understood as part of the prophet's plea. It will follow from this that neither the plural imperative nor the clause **הנני מקים** can have formed part of the original. It is probable, also, that the verse contained a *reference to the nations*, for in what follows the prophet is mainly concerned with the treatment they are receiving at the hands of the foe; for this reason the M.T. **בגוים** is more probable than the LXX. **בגרים**. On the supposition, then, that the present text represents substantially the original, we may understand the passage either (1) to contain an appeal to Jehovah to look at the nations and see what is happening among them, or else (2) to introduce a description of the nation's surprise at what is happening in their days. Of these alternatives the second is perhaps the more probable; in this case the prophet will be directing attention to the astonishment which the Chaldean army is causing among the nations. In the original the text may possibly have read **ראו הגוים והביטו¹ התמהמהו ותמהו² (?) כי פָּעַל** (or **יפִעַל**) **בימיהם לא יאמינו כי יספר⁶ (v.) כי הנה הכשדים וג'.** This would not involve much change; the substitution of **הגוים** for **בגוים**, and the change of the second into the third person would be all that would essentially affect the consonantal text. If this view be correct, we may suppose that an editor at the time of the exile or perhaps later desired to make clear—what events had only too truly proved to be the case—that the

¹ For the ך cop. cf. Is. 1², 2¹¹, etc.—Dr. *Tenses*, § 131, 2.

Chaldean had been raised up for judgment on the nation. Accordingly understanding vv. ²⁻⁴ to refer to violence and wickedness within Judah, he so altered the text in v. ⁵ and v. ^{6a} as to make the prophet announce as a future event the appearance of the Chaldean rather than refer to that power as a present evil and scourge within the land.

Chapter 2. The interpretation, which we have suggested as a possible solution of the difficulties in ch. 1, will have made sufficiently clear that the prophet is treating not of two distinct subjects but of one only. Accordingly he will not be understood to complain, in the first place, of the wickedness of his own nation and predict their judgment at the hands of the Chaldeans, and then, in vv. ^{12ff} of the wickedness of the latter people and predict in a similar manner their coming judgment; but throughout the chapter he will have in view simply the outrage which the Chaldeans are inflicting on the peoples and which, on account of its continuance and the disastrous effect which it is having on the welfare of the Jewish nation, (cf. 1^{3b, 4}) is giving the righteous just cause for alarm and perplexity. What follows in 2¹⁻⁴ gives Jehovah's answer to the prophet's plea. It is that 'his soul (*viz.* the Chaldean's) is puffed up, is not even in him; but the righteous will live by his faithfulness.' The first part—'his soul is puffed up, is not even within him'—forms a suitable answer to the question which the prophet has raised in ch. 1.

*Jehovah's
answer.*

There, as we have seen, the outrage and violence of the Chaldeans suggest to him a moral difficulty; how can Jehovah, the Pure and Holy One, allow such a power, so outrageous and grasping in its acts, to go on unchecked? Will it be thus permitted—he asks—to continue the merciless treatment it is showing towards the peoples? In answer to this Jehovah points to the pride of the conquerors, and in so doing, not only confirms the prophet's impression of the latter, but implies that it will sooner or later encompass their ruin. The second half of the answer—'The righteous shall live by his faithfulness'—is perhaps not so obvious, since the prophet has nowhere *directly* raised the question as to what will be the destiny of the righteous. Still this is more apparent than true; for, though his thoughts centre mainly on the character of the Chaldeans and the destiny which awaits them, he nevertheless betrays (cf. esp. 1¹²) a deep concern as to the future which lies before his people. As a true Judean prophet he knows full well how intimately involved was the welfare of Judah in the affairs of the peoples, while the circumstances to which he refers in 1^{3b}, 4 show only too plainly that to him the welfare of the nation was at stake. In fact, it may be said that the moral question, with which he deals, would only directly suggest itself and call for some explanation when it was seen that it was one which vitally concerned the wellbeing of

the state. It is but natural, then, that in the answer given in 2¹⁻⁴ reference should have been made to the righteous and indeed to the future which, in contrast to the Chaldeans, was awaiting them.

*An objection
answered.*

It has been objected that the answer, as a whole, is too meagre; that we should have expected the power which is to cause the fall of the oppressor to have been mentioned or at any rate their fall to have been more explicitly referred to (cf. *Encyc. Bib. col.* 1922, 1923; We. *Kl. Proph.* p. 163). But this is to attribute to the prophet more knowledge than he possessed; for if, as is likely, he wrote in the early years of the Chaldean movement, it would be more than improbable to suppose that he had any definite knowledge as to how or by whom that power was to be overthrown. Moreover to urge this as an objection would be to mistake the real purpose of his message. His purpose is neither to describe how or by what means the Chaldeans will be destroyed, nor even mainly to predict in an explicit and direct manner their fall; but *to call attention to the character which they display* and to impress upon his fellow-countrymen that that character is the earnest of what their destiny will be, just as in the same way he points out that faithfulness will in the end be seen to be the quality in virtue of which the righteous will live. And so far from its being too meagre to be revealed, it was just this one truth which needed to be impressed on the mind of the nation, and on the

realisation of which its welfare depended; for if we have rightly interpreted 1^{3, 4}, and the time was actually one of party strife, in which the authoritative direction of the prophets was inclined to be rejected in view of threatened invasion, such an answer as the prophet is here commanded to give would not only come as a message of comfort and assurance to the righteous, but would be one further testimony to the nation at large as to the course in which their safety lay. It is improbable also that the answer which Jehovah commanded the prophet to write on public tablets would have been of any considerable content; the injunction, thus given, would admirably suit the terse, pithy utterance of 2⁴, which may be compared with the passage in Is. 8¹ in connection with which a similar injunction is found.

2⁵, the text of which is far from certain, is best understood as the prophet's commentary on the above message, and as forming a transition to the following series of 'mashals' in which the character of the Chaldeans is vividly portrayed.

The passage (2⁶⁻²⁰) is divided into five sections: *The 'Mashals,* vv. 6-8, vv. 9-11, vv. 12-14, vv. 15-17 and vv. 18-20; each ^{2⁶ 20}. section, with the exception of the last (though in all probability v. 19 should precede v. 18), is introduced by הוי (R.V. 'Woe') and each is apparently termed a 'mashal,' cf. v. 6a. The Hebrew 'mashal' is a word of wide significance and its precise con-

notation in each case must be judged from the context in which it occurs. In the present passage the word is defined by the following words מליצה and חידת, which respectively mean 'a turned or figurative saying' and 'a riddle'; in this case the idea intended by משל would seem to be that of a figurative, indirect utterance, though, as the passage implies, one which was uttered in a taunting and sarcastic way. Accordingly the character of the oppressor in these verses will not be described in plain, straightforward language but indirectly and in a figurative manner. That this is so seems further indicated by the fact that the הוי clause is *mostly* followed by another, which explains its meaning and application, cf. vv. 8, 10, 16. It is, therefore, important to bear in mind that the 'mashals' of these sections are to be distinguished from such direct statements as are found, for instance, in Is. 5⁵, 11 and which are introduced in a similar way. In the one case we have suggestive pictures or sayings, in the other plain statements. It is necessary to insist on this, because it will be seen that it is to some extent due to the fact that these verses have been interpreted *literally* that their authenticity has been questioned.

Their genuineness discussed.

The genuineness of section vv. 9-20 has been called into question mainly on two grounds. It has been felt, partly, that much of it is unsuitable to the Chaldeans, and, partly, that it is dependent on other Old Testament passages. The first, who

questioned the section as a whole, was Stade.¹ This scholar maintained that the 'mashals' in vv. 9-11 and vv. 15-17 are inapplicable to the Chaldeans and refer rather to some Palestinian tyrant who had established his power by oppression and who, according to vv. 15-17, had been celebrating in his newly built fortress a drinking-bout with his companions; while both vv. 12-14 and vv. 18-20, the former on account of its quotations, and the latter on account of its subject, were regarded by him as later insertions. Kuenen likewise rejected these four 'mashals' on similar grounds. Since then most scholars have doubted one or more passages of the section, though there is a general tendency now to regard vv. 9-11 and most of vv. 15-17 as genuine. Now the objection which has been made to vv. 9-11 and vv. 15-17 will really be seen to rest on the assumption that their 'mashals' are intended to be literally applied; but this, as we have just remarked, is to mistake the character of the 'mashal,' which is intended to be rather a suggestive picture than to be one of literal application. Accordingly, though what Stade has said with reference to these passages *may quite well have given rise to the terms* of the 'mashals,' they are not in the present case to be so interpreted; rather are they intended to portray in an indirect, though highly suggestive, way the character of the oppressors. Thus in

¹ Compare *ZATW*. 1884, pp. 154-159.

vv. ⁹⁻¹¹ the violent means by which they have endeavoured to secure themselves against misfortune is referred to, and similarly in vv. ¹⁵⁻¹⁷ we have a suggestive picture of the humiliation and contemptuous treatment to which they have subjected the vanquished. Both these features would suit admirably the description of the Chaldean in ch. 1, and both passages resemble vv. ⁶⁻⁸ in structure. There would, therefore, be no sufficient reason for regarding them as not genuine. The case, however, may be different with regard to vv. ¹²⁻¹⁴ and vv. ¹⁸⁻²⁰. In vv. ¹²⁻¹⁴ the meaning would be applicable to the Chaldeans; for (since we are not to press the terms in a literal sense) all that the verses would imply is that the Chaldeans have been acting similarly to some tyrant; just as the tyrant builds up his capital by acts of iniquity and bloodshed, so have they—it would be implied—been building up their empire. But, as it has been repeatedly pointed out, these verses resemble verbally other passages in the Old Testament, *e.g.* v. ¹² = Mic. 3¹⁰; v. ¹³ = Jer. 51^{58b} and v. ¹⁴ = Is. 11^{9b}. This apparent literary dependence does excite suspicion; as a later editor, wishing to supplement the ‘*mashals*,’ would not unnaturally draw from other Old Testament writings. Still in itself this is not a sufficient reason why Habakkuk should not himself have written them down.¹ There are, however, two

¹ In this case the verses may either be actually citations (at least in

reasons which would go to prove their unauthenticity.

(a) If we compare the verses with vv. 9-11 and vv. 15-17, we notice that the structure is different; we miss, namely, a reference in the 2nd pers. sing. to the Chaldeans which we find in the latter passages; while (b) they do not add very much to the description which the other 'mashals' give of the Chaldean. In fact they may be said to be practically equivalent to vv. 9-11, and indeed they look as if they had been actually added by an editor as a commentary on the latter passage for the purpose of showing how futile such efforts are. The expression כבוד יהוה (v. 14) and the phrase 'הלֹא הִנֵּה וג' (as emended, cf. *Notes on Heb. Text*, p. 206) in v. 13 would tend also to prove a later date. On the whole, then, we are inclined to regard the section in question (vv. 12-14) as suspicious. Still more doubtful are vv. 18-20. For (a) the structure is different from that found in vv. 6-8, vv. 9-11 and vv. 15-17; (b) the verse introduced by הוּא is of a different type to the 'mashals' noticed above, and (c) the theoretical condemnation of idolatry is similar to what we find e.g. in Deutero-Isaiah, while (d) v. 20 is clearly editorial. For these reasons vv. 18, 19 are most probably to be regarded as a later addition, made perhaps by an editor who thought that something ought to be said against the idolatry of the Chaldeans; and v. 20,

case of vv. 12, 14) or else—and this would be more probable—they had become in the prophet's day current proverbial expressions.

which is transitional, will probably be a still later addition. While fully allowing, then, the authenticity of vv. 6-8, vv. 9-11, vv. 15-17 we would mark as doubtful vv. 11-14, and, with still greater confidence, vv. 18-20. With these three 'mashals' the original book of Habakkuk probably closed; for, as we have had already occasion to remark, there are good reasons for believing the psalm in ch. 3 to have formed no original part of the prophet's writing.

§ 2. THE DATE AND CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE PROPHECY.

*Connection of
thought in
chs. 1 and 2.*

The aim of the previous pages has been to ascertain the point of connection between the different sections of chs. 1 and 2; and, in course of our argument, we have been led to the following conclusions: (1) that the violence, of which the prophet speaks in 1^{2,4}, was such as was being perpetrated by the Chaldeans among the peoples; and that his concern was due to the bad consequences which it was having on the welfare of his own country. (2) That vv. 1⁵, 6^a in their original form were most probably not an announcement of the Chaldean but a *continuation* of the prophet's expostulation with Jehovah, in which he called attention to the utter amazement of the nations at the 'work which was being done among them,' and of which (v. 6^a) the Chaldean was the instrument. (3) That 1^{6b-11} are not to be

understood as a description of the Chaldean, whose advent was only announced, but were intended to represent an actual picture of the trouble and mischief which that power was then causing, and which everywhere filled the land. (4) That 1¹²⁻¹⁷ are still a continuation of the prophet's remonstrance. Though assured that the Chaldean was being raised up for judgment, he could not help being perplexed that Jehovah should allow its excessive violence and tyranny to continue unheeded. And (5) that 2^{1ff} introduces Jehovah's answer to the prophet's complaint in ch. 1; the answer given implying the future downfall of the oppressor. Such would appear to be the connection of thought in these chapters. And we may now proceed to inquire into the circumstances which occasioned the prophecy, and endeavour to ascertain the approximate date of its composition. Now there are several considerations which will help us in our inquiry; we notice (α) that the prophet's thoughts centre chiefly on the violence and mischief which were being perpetrated on the nations in general. Thus in 1⁵ (if the text has been rightly emended) it is the *nations* that are amazed at the work which is being done: 'The nations have looked and beheld; they tarry and are astonished, for a work is being done in their days, which they would not believe, were it told them.' And so in 1¹⁰ it is the kings and princes at whom the conquerors mock and whose fortresses they capture; while in 1¹³⁻¹⁷ their

*Data for
ascertaining
date.*

victims are referred to either as 'those who are more righteous than themselves' (v. ¹³) or as 'men' (v. ¹⁴) or, quite plainly, as 'the nations' (v. ¹⁷). And so again in 2⁶ it is the nations who are represented as taking up the taunt-song over their fallen foe (cp. also 2⁵). (β) That the foe thought of is the Chaldean. This is expressly stated in 1^{6a}, the accuracy of which statement we have seen no reason for doubting. (γ) That there are no indications that Judah had been or was actually being invaded at the time when the prophet wrote. This is in fact clear from (α) according to which the prophet's attention is directly occupied with what was being done by the Chaldeans among the nations, and not what was being done among his own people. But (δ) while this is the case, such an invasion, on the other hand, was highly probable and was in fact contemplated by the prophet. Thus in 1¹² the prophet expresses his assurance that they would not perish (if text is correct) in the imminent invasion, and that it is for judgment and for correction that the Chaldeans have been appointed; and again in 2⁴, in Jehovah's answer to the prophet's remonstrance, it is expressly pointed out that the righteous (*i.e.* the true Israelites) will survive, viz. the coming judgment, by their faithfulness. It follows (ε) from this latter observation that, at the time when the prophecy was spoken, there was no likelihood of a cessation of hostility. This is implied also in the question which the prophet raises in 1¹⁷:

‘Will he therefore draw his sword (so prob. emend) and continually kill nations unsparingly.’ (ε) That Lebanon in particular had been the scene of violence and destruction. This is expressly stated in the ‘mashal’ in 2¹⁴. (η) That the description in 1⁶⁻¹¹ and the ‘mashals’ in ch. 2 would indicate that some time had elapsed since the Chaldeans had first appeared on the stage of history. This need not of course be considerable, but it would demand such time as would be sufficient to make clear to every one their purpose and for a series of victories to have been won. At the same time the way in which they are referred to would indicate that they were now for the first time being seriously brought to the notice of the prophet and his contemporaries. And lastly, (θ) that the crisis was having a bad effect on prophetic teaching and social life in Judah. It is not simply the outrage on the nations that the prophet has in view, but it is the outrage on the nations *as it relates also* to his own country. He does not speak merely as the champion of the nations’ cause, but as a true Judean prophet, who knows how intimately involved are the affairs of his own country in those of the surrounding nations. Thus he deplors the violence which the Chaldeans are perpetrating, and the tyranny which they are exercising, not only because such appear to be a moral injustice, not only because there is the danger lest the same will also befall his own nation, *but* because these acts of vio-

lence and tyranny are sowing party discord, rendering ineffectual the prophetic Torah by setting in movement some 'wicked' policy or other, and, in consequence, thwarting the efforts of the righteous who are endeavouring to follow out the right course of action (1^{3b}, 4). These indications which the prophecy gives would point to the years immediately succeeding the rise of the Chaldean (or Babylonian) Empire, when this power first made its appearance in the west. Since Nineveh, the seat of the Assyrian Empire, fell before the combined forces of the Chaldeans and Medes in 606 B.C., or possibly 607 B.C., and the victory at Carchemish, which first opened

Date soon after
605 B.C.

out the west to the conqueror, was gained in 605 B.C., we may conclude with some confidence that the prophecy of Habakkuk dates from the years immediately following the latter event.

Unfortunately we have not so much information, as we would desire, for this critical period in the history of Judah and of the other neighbouring states. No inscription has yet been found which throws any considerable light on the events of these years, and we have thus to depend almost entirely on such information as may be gathered from Biblical sources. The latter comprise the short section in 2 K. 23³¹-24^{1f} and its parallel passage in 2 Chr. 36^{1f}, and some historical notes and allusions in the book of Jeremiah.¹ The rise and progress of the Chaldean or Babylonian

¹ Comp. also Dan. 1^{1ff}.

power and their bearing on the history of Judah therefore can, in the absence of fuller and more authoritative information, only be sketched in the main with more or less certainty.

Soon after the fall of Nineveh and perhaps after quelling the different raids which were being made into Mesopotamia at that time, Nebuchadrezzar, Nabopolassar's eldest son and general, turned his attention to the Egyptians. The latter, who on the decline of the Assyrian Empire had set out to assert their power over Syria, had been successful in bringing Judah and the Syrian states under their rule, and by the year 609 or 608 B.C. had reached Riblah. Here it would seem Necho II. had pitched his headquarters,¹ and had thence extended his operations to the western banks of the Euphrates. This threatening attitude of Egypt and their desire to maintain their supremacy over Syria on the fall of Assyria naturally brought them into immediate contact with the Babylonian power, which, on the capture of Nineveh, claimed as its share of spoil the regions south and west of the Tigris. The decisive battle was fought at Carchemish in which Nebuchadrezzar gained a complete victory over the Egyptian army 605 B.C. The power of Egypt was broken and Necho was henceforth compelled to relinquish his

*The history of
the Period.*

¹ The village was admirably suited for this purpose; it lay on the main road from Egypt to Babylon and in the vale between the two ranges of the Lebanon, and commanded a good position, cf. *HDB.* sub. 'Riblah.'

hold on Syria. It is precisely at this point, however, that authentic records fail us, and we are more or less left in the dark as to the exact course events took. The battle of Carchemish is in fact only once referred to in the Old Testament, and that neither in the narrative of 2 Kings nor in the parallel narrative of 2 Chron. but in one of the historical introductions of Jeremiah (Jer. 24²). It is accordingly uncertain what circumstances exactly marked the period immediately succeeding this event. Josephus (*Ant.* X. vi.), after describing the defeat of the Egyptians at Carchemish, concludes with the words, 'So the king of Babylon passed over Euphrates and took all Syria, as far as Pelusium, excepting Judaea. But when Nebuchadrezzar had already reigned four years, which was the eighth of Jehoiakim's government over the Hebrews, the king of Babylon made an expedition with mighty forces against the Jews and required tribute of Jehoiakim and threatened, on his refusal, to make war against him. He was affrighted at his threatening and bought his peace with money and brought the tribute he was ordered to bring for three years.' The same writer then proceeds to relate how that in the third year Jehoiakim, relying on help from Egypt, rebelled; and, on being besieged by Nebuchadrezzar, received the latter at length into the city and met death at his hands after a reign of eleven years. From this account we gather that Nebuchadrezzar, immediately

Josephus' narrative not wholly trustworthy.

after the battle of Carchemish, pursued the Egyptians as far as the border of their own country and brought the whole of Syria under his rule with the exception of Judah ; that four years later, *i.e.* 601 or 600 B.C., Nebuchadrezzar came up to Jerusalem and received tribute from Jehoiakim who, after paying tribute for three years, at length rebelled ; and that in consequence of this rebellion the Babylonians made a second expedition against Jerusalem (598 or 597 B.C.). This account it will be observed is based to some extent on the Biblical narrative ; thus 2 K. 24 (cf. v. ¹⁶) mentions that in the days of Jehoiakim Nebuchadrezzar came up and made Judah tributary for three years and that in the third year Jehoiakim rebelled. The same narrative also adds in a note, which seems to have no connection with what immediately precedes, that ‘the king of Egypt came not again any more out of his land ; for the king of Babylon had taken from the brook of Egypt unto the river Euphrates all that pertained to the king of Egypt.’ This may refer to the conquest of Egypt, of which Josephus speaks, after the battle of Carchemish, or possibly to the time when Nebuchadrezzar first received Jehoiakim’s submission, in which case the writer may perhaps be understood to connect the event with some intrigue with Egypt. We cannot, however, accept Josephus’ account as it stands. His view that not only the expulsion of the Egyptians from Syria but also the battle of Carchemish took

place in the first year of Nebuchadrezzar's reign is almost certainly incorrect. Nebuchadrezzar did not come to the throne till 604 B.C., and the battle of Carchemish seems certainly to have been fought in 605 B.C.¹ Moreover it is unlikely that Judah, as Josephus makes out, so long remained independent after the rest of Syria had been brought under Babylonian rule; such a statement is either due to national bias which sought to show the superiority and independence of Judah, or else—and this is more probable—to the writer's desire to reconcile the passage in 2 K. 24¹ with the rest of his account.

But while pointing out these difficulties in Josephus' account it is not easy, in the absence of any thorough and unambiguous data, to construct with chronological precision the history of this period (605-598 or 597 B.C.). It is probable, however, that after the battle of Carchemish Nebuchadrezzar, as Josephus states, continued his advance against Egypt and that he either had already reached the border of Egypt (cf. Josephus²) or, perhaps more probably, had not yet completed his advance against Egypt and the further subjugation of the Syrian states when he heard of the death of his father and

¹ Cf. *Jos. Ant.* X. vi. 1. This is borne out by Berosus, whose account, though obviously confused and abridged, nevertheless gives the impression that Nebuchadrezzar had already at least begun his operations with Egypt before he received the news of the death of his father and succeeded to the throne, cf. *Jos. Ant.* X. xi. 1.

² This may quite well have happened during the interval between the battle of Carchemish and the death of Nabopolassar.

had to hasten back to Babylon.¹ But it would not ² K. 24¹. be long before Nebuchadrezzar would be back again in Syria, for it is hardly conceivable that any permanent conquest had yet been effected, even if Syria had previously submitted to his rule, and it was here moreover rather than in any other quarter of his empire that danger threatened his power. Accordingly we may suppose that by the end of 604 B.C. or at the beginning of 603 B.C. Nebuchadrezzar was already again in Syria, and that Judah along with the other Syrian states now acknowledged his supremacy. The note in 2 K. 24¹ may be taken to refer to this time.² The chronology of this note, however, occasions some difficulty. If it gives the correct date of Jehoiakim's submission, then his rebellion will have taken place in 601 or 600 B.C.; three years before his death.³ It is felt that three years would be too long an interval before the investiture of the city by Nebuchadrezzar. In view of this it has been suggested⁴ that for 'three' we should read 'six.'

¹ It is likely that after his victory at Carchemish he had made Riblah, as Necho had done, his headquarters and the centre of his further operations in Syria.

² 'In his days Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon came up, and Jehoiakim became his servant three years: then he turned and rebelled against him.'

³ This would be still more evident if with some scholars we place Jehoiakim's submission prior to Nebuchadrezzar's return to Babylon, comp. H. P. Smith, *O. T. History*, p. 283.

⁴ So McCurdy, *Hist. Proph. and Monum.* vol. iii. p. 167 f. Maspero thinks that Jehoiakim submitted in 605 (this is not mentioned in 2 Kings), rebelled in 601, when Nebuchadrezzar came up (cf. 2 K. 24¹),

This, which is a simple change, would obviate the difficulty; still it is doubtful whether we should have recourse to this expedient. The third year may represent the time when the movement towards rebellion was first set on foot; and it may have been only later, when open hostility towards the empire became manifest, that the break was finally effected. Moreover we have no knowledge as to the nature and circumstances of the rebellion. It is more than probable, especially in view of 2 K. 24⁷ which at first sight seems to have no apparent connection, that the real cause of rebellion was a renewed activity on the part of Egypt. The latter may well have planned some large scheme of revolt with the other Syrian states, in which Judah took part, for throwing off the Chaldean supremacy. We know that that happened in the days of the Assyrian domination, and it is not probable that the Egyptians would now quietly submit to the Babylonian power. This would help to explain why some time elapsed before Nebuchadrezzar appeared in person in Judah, and why, on the other hand, the latter was first opposed (mostly) by eastern tribes; for Nebuchadrezzar would have first to direct his attention to Egypt and the other states and it would only be at a later time that he would be able to turn to Judah. At the most, however, this can remain only a hypothesis and, until more

and three years afterwards rebelled again. Cf. Maspero, *Passing of the Empire*, pp. 515 ff.

information is forthcoming as to the circumstances of these years than is at present at our disposal, it is impossible to say for certain what exactly was the course events took. But in any case it seems best to regard the year 604 B.C. or the beginning of 603 B.C. as the approximate date when Jehoiakim openly submitted to the Babylonian supremacy.

We have been led to dwell at some length on the circumstances of this period because, as we have already remarked, it is to the early years of the Chaldean invasion that we must assign the short prophecy of Habakkuk. We have noted, also, that, at the time when the prophet wrote, Judah was probably being threatened by the Chaldeans. This would suggest either the year 604 or 603 B.C. when Nebuchadrezzar came up and received the submission of Jehoiakim, or perhaps the later invasion subsequent to Jehoiakim's rebellion in 601 or 600 B.C.

The former and earlier date is, however, by far the most probable; for throughout the whole prophecy there is not the slightest indication that the Chaldeans have as yet *directly* interfered with the affairs of Judah, and the way in which the Chaldeans are described would at least indicate that they are being alluded to as a rising power which for the first time was really assuming a threatening attitude. But though, so far as Judah was concerned, their power had still not been experienced, yet its character was fully gauged and known, so that the prophecy must

*Occasion of
prophecy:
Nebuchad-
rezzar's ap-
proach in 604
or 603 B.C.*

have been written after the battle of Carchemish (605 B.C.) and the events immediately subsequent to that battle. The most natural occasion, therefore, for the prophecy would be on the approach of Nebuchadrezzar in the year 604 or the beginning of 603 B.C. This date would agree with Jer. 36^{9, 30}, where the fast proclaimed in the 5th year and the 9th month was apparently in view of the approach of the Chaldeans.

*The fortunes
of the 'Pro-
phetic' Party.*

The period was one which must have caused much distress and even misgiving to the faithful Israelite. Not only was the Chaldean power assuming an alarming attitude, and, by the successes which everywhere attended its progress, giving the impression that its domination would be far-reaching, but the circumstances of the age and the fortunes of the faithful must have been far from bright. We have to picture within Judah a band of resolute, courageous men, devoted to the cause and religion of Jehovah, whose controlling influence was the *Torah* of the prophets. They were the adherents and champions of the latter. As a definite party they may have owed their origin to the influence and teaching of Isaiah; at any rate it was just those principles, which he had put forward and maintained with such enthusiasm and zeal and which his successors in the prophetic office endorsed, for which they stood. They upheld the sovereignty of Jehovah; His supreme control over the powers of the world; and

the need of whole-hearted trust in His power and protection.¹ They, accordingly, opposed any policy which tended to compromise that position; they discountenanced intrigue and alliance with foreign powers, strongly denounced those who would rely on external help, and at each crisis advocated the duty of yielding themselves unreservedly to the Divine Will. During the preceding decades they would appear to have become a strong body and to have so won their way into the influential circles of Judah that in the reign of Josiah they were actually in the ascendancy at Jerusalem. One product of their labours was the promulgation of the 'Book of the Law.' This won the king to their cause, and enabled them for the first time to put into force the reform which the prophets had so long advocated. We have little information of the circumstances attending this reform; but their prospects must have been bright, in spite of the opposition which would confront them on all sides, and, had circumstances shaped themselves differently, their labours must sooner or later have effected much towards realising that ideal which inspired their efforts. But their hopes were short-lived and their labours soon checked. Josiah met his death in battle against the Egyptian Necho at Megiddo in 609 or 608 B.C. It is a matter of conjecture why Josiah was led to oppose the Egyptian army, but it seems probable that 'he acted as he did

¹ Comp. *Encyc. Bib.* col. 2244.

trusting in Jehovah,'¹ and because he regarded it as his duty to avert foreign interference in Palestine and Syria. If we are correct in this supposition, then we may see in his action the influence of the prophetic party who were averse, as we have already remarked, to any foreign interference, especially Egyptian. That they were then taking a large and active part in the political affairs of Judah is further indicated perhaps by the fact that Josiah's third son Jehoahaz was chosen as successor. Jehoahaz, however, after reigning but three months was forced to appear before Necho at Riblah, where he was deposed and sent captive to Egypt (cf. Jer. 22^{10ff}). We do not know the exact circumstances which necessitated his appearance at Riblah. But it is not unreasonable to think that it was brought about by that party who favoured Jehoiakim and who were not averse to the Egyptian claim. In any case it is probable that Necho deposed Jehoahaz because the latter, like his father, was unwilling to acknowledge his authority. The succession of Jehoiakim placed the government of affairs into the hands of the opponents of the prophetic party; and, so long as the monarchy lasted, the latter were never again in the ascendancy. A fresh crisis was soon to follow. Nineveh fell in 606 B.C.; and the Chaldeans followed up this victory as we have seen by defeating the Egyptian army at Carchemish in 605 B.C. Whatever hopes the prophetic

¹ Comp. *Encyc. Bib.* col. 2247.

party may have had on the defeat of their old foe, they could not have remained for long in doubt as to what would prove in the end to be the real issue of events. For, if indeed not before the battle of Carchemish, certainly not long after that event, it must have become evident that the goal of the Babylonian power was not only the subjugation of Egypt, but also that of the Syrian and Palestinian states. The future can have held out for them no brighter prospect than the transference of their nation's allegiance from the Egyptian throne to a power, which was not only more than a match for the latter, but whose pretensions bid fair to be far-reaching in extent.

The new power, then, which entered on the stage of western history in 605 B.C. must have caused no little consternation and perplexity to the faithful within Israel; and it is not surprising to find one among them raising his voice in bitter complaint to Jehovah. Habakkuk looks forth on the scene which the circumstances of the time present. The violence and devastation, the trouble and mischief which he sees the Chaldeans are causing, are no matter of indifference to him, for he knows how intimately involved is the welfare of his country in the affairs of the neighbouring states. He has constantly addressed Jehovah against the work which is being done among them; but as yet there has been no answer, no sign of deliverance: 'How long Jehovah have I cried, and

Their perplexity voiced by Habakkuk.

Thou hearest not? I cry out unto Thee, Violence! but Thou bringest no deliverance.' On the contrary the Chaldeans have continued unchecked, unhindered in the course on which they are set; they 'march through the breadth of the earth, to possess dwellings that are not theirs'; they 'gather captives as the sand,' 'mock at kings' and 'deride princes'; they 'swallow up men that are more righteous than themselves,' and like some fisherman 'take up all of them with the angle,' and 'gather them into their drag.' The prophet feels assured that as a nation Judah will not perish (cf. 1¹²) and that it is for judgment that the Chaldeans have been appointed: 'For judgment Thou hast set them, to rebuke hast Thou appointed them.' Still the question forces itself upon him as to what will be the destiny of this rapidly rising power; will Jehovah, the Pure and Holy One, thus permit it to go on committing the violence and outrage that it is doing? Can it be that it will realise its purpose and 'continually kill nations unsparingly'? So he speaks out the perplexity which the progress of the Chaldean power is causing not only to himself but to the righteous as well. Then he repairs to his watch-tower and seeks for an answer. And there at length he becomes conscious of what answer Jehovah would have him return; and, like Isaiah before him, has it written on tablets, so that all may read: 'And Jehovah answered me and said, "Write the vision, and make it plain upon tables, that he may run that

readeth it. For the vision is yet for the appointed time, and it hasteth towards the end, and shall not lie: though it tarry, wait for it; because it will surely come, it will not delay. Behold, his soul is puffed up, it is not even in him; but the righteous shall live by his faithfulness." The Chaldeans will not attain their purpose; Jehovah has fixed the appointed time, when the pride and rapacity and insatiability which they show will encompass their ruin, while the righteous will survive by their faithfulness.

The prophet, it will be seen, does not ask what is the *meaning* or *significance* of this new phenomenon which has appeared on the stage of history. That indeed he knows (1¹²). Nor does he directly raise the question why evil and wrong should be thus allowed to triumph—a question which was first definitely raised at a later period in Israel's history. But he asks what will be the issue; will the Chaldeans maintain their present progress and become in the end (for so we are led to infer) a world-power perhaps greater and more enduring than the Assyrian power that has just perished? That is his question. And the way in which he raises it forecasts the nature of the answer that is returned. The violence and evil committed by the Chaldeans, their moral indifference and insatiability, on which he dwells, mark out the destiny of this people; they are the sure indication of their coming ruin.

Incidentally the prophet also, as we have seen,

refers to the state of affairs within Judah at this epoch. The rise of the Chaldean power and the formidable and threatening attitude which it is assuming are directly effecting the work and efforts of the righteous; they are sowing discord; 'strife and contention rise up,' says the prophet, 'therefore *Torah* is numbed, and right will never go forth for wickedness beleaguers the righteous.' The political factions, which perhaps for some time had fallen into abeyance, had now come once more to the front, and confusion and strife were prevalent; in consequence of this the *Torah*, or true policy of the prophets, was being paralysed, and the righteous, through being opposed continually by some counter policy or other, were despairing of ever carrying out the right course of action. The allusion is interesting, because it confirms what we should naturally have supposed must have been the situation in Judah at this time. We do not know precisely the nature of these political factions or what was being advocated in view of the approaching invasion. But, to judge from what we know of the other crises in Judah's history and also from the allusions in Jeremiah, we should gather that there would be a large party—probably the most influential—who were ready to stand by Egypt and endeavour with them to secure the arrest of the Chaldean advance. What special policy also the prophetic party advocated at this particular stage in the Chaldean movement is not

*The political
factions and
the policy of
the 'Prophetic'
Party.*

altogether certain, yet, in view of the attitude which Jeremiah adopted, and the growing certainty that their independence could not be maintained before so strong a power, it is more than probable that they advised yielding themselves unreservedly to the Divine will and submitting to the Chaldean domination. In fact the prophecy seems strongly to presuppose this policy (cf. esp. 1^{12b}).

The message, then, which Habakkuk would give, is one of encouragement. The sudden rise of the Chaldean power, the formidable and rapid advance which it made, must, as we have said, have bewildered and unnerved not only the nation in general, but especially those who were loyally endeavouring to maintain unimpaired the religion of Jehovah. Many of the faithful, doubtless, must have been tempted as they beheld the acts of violence and tyranny that were being done to waver in their allegiance and even openly to apostatize. And so, like another Isaiah, Habakkuk comes forward at the crisis of his people, and gives them the reassuring message that these Chaldean conquerors, though they have been raised up for judgment, and though their power seems so assured, will on account of the violence and tyranny which they are exercising be just the ones—and not the righteous—that *in the end* will succumb. It has been thought that the teaching of Habakkuk and that of his contemporary, Jeremiah, are opposed; that the former took a similar view

*The prophet's
message of
comfort.*

*His teaching
compared with
Jeremiah's.*

of the Chaldean invasion to that of the professional prophets, who, as Jeremiah tells us, prophesied peace for Judah. But this is not the case. Habakkuk does not for one moment doubt that the Chaldeans have been raised up for judgment; indeed he expressly states this to be the case (1¹²); while the answer which he receives—‘And the righteous shall live by his faithfulness’—seems certainly to imply that the nation will have to experience that judgment. The teaching of the two prophets is, in fact, not opposed but rather supplementary; the one completes the teaching of the other. Jeremiah addresses all classes among the nation; Habakkuk speaks as one of the faithful within Judah and confines himself chiefly to what concerns their interests. Jeremiah seeks to awaken the conscience of the nation in view of what is about to befall them at the hands of the Chaldeans; Habakkuk speaks to the heart of the righteous Israelite and assures him that he will survive by virtue of his faithfulness to Jehovah the nation’s crisis. Jeremiah centres his thoughts on the judgment which the Chaldeans are to effect; Habakkuk, on the contrary, looks into the future and reads the judgment which in turn is to befall them.

To our prophet that judgment seemed near, although from the somewhat indefinite way in which he speaks of it, it is evident that he had no certain knowledge by whom or in what way it was to be

effected. But he felt no doubt that, in view of the outrage and evil which the Chaldeans were committing, punishment could not for long be delayed. In reality, however, many decades had to pass before his message was fulfilled; and much, too, had to happen. His nation had to leave their land and experience the bitterness of exile; yet even then Jehovah did not forsake His people. The Chaldean power, like the mighty power that preceded it, vanished from the stage of history, and the prophet's message of comfort and assurance that the righteous would live by their faithfulness proved true, but in a way which he little thought of or expected.

§ 3. THE PERSONAL HISTORY OF THE PROPHET.

We have no certain information respecting the life of the prophet Habakkuk. He is not again mentioned, either in the historical narratives or elsewhere in the Old Testament; and all that we can learn about him has to be derived from the writing which bears his name. In the title he is simply spoken of as 'the prophet,' and no mention is made either of his parentage or of the time in which he lived. From 3¹⁹—'For the precentor on *my* stringed instruments'—it has been inferred that he belonged to one of the Levitical families,¹ and for this reason was associated with the arrangement of the Temple

¹ So Delitzsch, Keil.

music, but the inference, though it receives support from a late tradition found in the *Chisianus Codex* of the 'Bel and the Dragon,'¹ is hardly trustworthy; for not only is the text in 3^{19b} doubtful, but the psalm itself, as we shall see later, is most probably not from the hand of the prophet at all. There is, moreover, nothing in chs. 1 and 2 which would tend to support this supposition.

In view of what has been said above with regard to the circumstances and date of the prophecy, Habakkuk will have lived during the early years of the Chaldean movement. We do not know the date of Isaiah's death, or how long he continued to prophesy after Sennacherib's invasion in 701 B.C., but it is hardly possible that Habakkuk could have been even a very late contemporary of that prophet. On the other hand, there is some reason for believing that he was closely associated with the disciples of the latter. Small as his prophecy is, the graphic and forcible style in which it is written, the literary resemblances which it contains, the method in which its subject is treated, and, above all, its teaching, would appear to indicate that the prophet had been at least indirectly influenced by Isaiah. We may compare, for instance, such parallels in language,

¹ In this codex the legend is prefaced by the words *ἐκ προφητείας Ἀμβρακίου υἱοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς Λευῖ*. But it is probable that this tradition was ultimately derived from the fact that the psalm in ch. 3 was accredited to the prophet and especially from the passage in v.¹⁹ quoted above.

thought and treatment, as are seen in: 1⁵ (where *התמהמהו ותמהו* is probably to be read) and Is. 29²⁰; the combination of *ראה* and *נבט* in 1^{3,5,13} and Is. 5¹² (though the combination, it is true, is more frequent in other writings); the expression *צור* as applied to Jehovah,¹ 1¹² and Is. 30²⁹ (cf. also 17¹⁰); the graphic description of the Chaldean in 1⁶⁻¹¹ and Isaiah's description of the invader in 5²⁶⁻²⁹; the characterization of the Chaldean in 1¹¹ and 16, and the similar characterization of the Assyrian in Is. 10¹³; the injunction to write the Divine answer on tablets in 2¹⁻⁴, and the similar injunction in Is. 8^{1,2}; and, lastly, Isaiah's emphasis on the pride and arrogancy of Assyria in 10^{5ff} as an indication of its coming fall, and the similar emphasis which Habakkuk places on the character of the Chaldean as a mark of their near destiny (cf. chs. 1 and 2⁴). Moreover, in maintaining that the safety of the righteous depended on their faithfulness to Jehovah, Habakkuk was essentially occupying the same theological position as Isaiah, and advocating that policy which the latter prophet had maintained and strove for with such courage and zeal. This and the resemblances, which we have just noted, would seem to argue strongly for the view that Habakkuk was a prominent member of the school of Isaiah, which after the latter's death laboured to carry on the teaching and policy of its founder.

Cf. also קרטי 1¹².

The name Habakkuk, if Assyrian, may perhaps have been either assumed by the prophet or given him in his early days, when the Assyrian domination was still powerful, as a mark of his nation's allegiance to that power (cf. Isaiah's denunciation of his nation's intrigue with Egypt as a breach of faith with Assyria). Moreover the reference in 1^{3, 4} to the presence of party strife and discord and to the fate of the *Torah* would indicate that he had a full knowledge of the political situation of his nation, and might, therefore, be taken as showing that he was actually a resident of the capital. Beyond these surmises, however, we cannot go. Nor can we accept the traditions that have gathered round his name. According to the 'Lives of the Prophets' (attributed to Dorotheus and also to Epiphanius) it is said that the prophet was of the tribe of Simeon, and that he fled to Ostrakine on the advance of Nebuchadrezzar but returned later to his own country, where he died two years before the return of the Jews from Babylon; while in the legend of 'Bel and the Dragon' he is represented as having miraculously fed Daniel, who had been cast into a den of lions by Cyrus. And Jewish legend has even identified him with the son of the Shunamite woman whom Elisha restored to life. These traditions, late and in part extravagant, cannot be seriously regarded as attributing any trustworthy information to our knowledge of the prophet's life.¹

¹ Comp. Delitzsch, *De Habacuci prophetæ vita atque ætate*.

§ 4. SOME CRITICAL VIEWS
ON CHAPTERS I AND 2¹⁻⁴.

Until the latter half of the last century neither the genuineness of the book nor its present arrangement was called into question ; the short oracle and the psalm, with which it concluded, were fully admitted not only to be the work of the prophet, whose name it bears, but to represent exactly that work as it left the hand of its author. In 1860, however, a different arrangement of the book was propounded, and some few verses were regarded as not genuine. The critic was a German scholar—von Gumpach ; and, though his view of the prophecy was not accepted by any other scholar nor became (except perhaps in the case of de Goeje's view) the basis for later and more adequate proposals, yet it is to him that the first critical attitude towards the book of Habakkuk is to be accredited. Since that date not only has the genuineness of certain sections of the book been doubted, but, especially in recent times, different arrangements of its contents have been suggested, and even the fact that it relates to the Chaldean power at all is now denied in some quarters. That this critical attitude towards the prophecy is not isolated is indicated by the fact that it is now generally agreed that the problems which the book raises are difficult and call for a more adequate explanation than that which

the traditional view adopts. At first it was to the section which comprises the 'mashals' in ch. 2^{off} and to the ode in ch. 3 that objection was taken, and, with the exception of de Goeje's theory as to the structure of the book in 1861, some thirty years elapsed since von Gumpach first published his studies on Habakkuk before any really critical view was advanced by way of solution for the difficulties which suggested themselves in chs. 1 and 2¹⁻⁴. It is with the latter that we are now more immediately concerned; and we propose to review briefly in the following pages some of the various views which have been put forward with regard to them. In view of this we might follow step by step the course which criticism has taken, and review chronologically the different theories that have been held; but it would seem on the whole better simply to attempt to classify them according to what will be seen to constitute respectively their chief feature or method of treatment.

*A proposed
classification
of the main
critical
theories ad-
vanced.*

We may, accordingly, classify the different proposals that have been made, under five heads, which may be designated respectively as: (1) the 'two-oracle' theory, (2) the 'fragmentary' or 'composite' theory, (3) the 're-constructive' theory, (4) the 'redactional' theory, and lastly (5) the 'interpretative' theory, or the theory which rests essentially on a difference of interpretation. It is no doubt true that the views which are set forth under these different

heads will be seen to have much in common with each other, and, therefore, a different arrangement might be adopted from that which is made here; but the present classification will, it is hoped, be seen to rest upon what would appear in each case to be the main distinguishing feature of the several views.

I. *The 'Two-oracle' theory.*—According to this theory either the book as a whole or more especially the section, chs. 1-2¹, is really composed, not of one connected oracle, but of two distinct oracles which by a later editor have been given the form of one prophecy. This view is in fact the oldest one which criticism has put forward. It was the one advanced by von Gumpach in 1860 and also in the following year by his critic, de Goeje. These writers both treated the book of Habakkuk as a whole and regarded it as the combination of two distinct prophecies. In 1854 von Gumpach had expressed the view that Habakkuk's first prophecy referred not to a Chaldean but to a Scythian invasion,¹ and this view he further developed in his commentary in 1860. He based it on the agreement² between the passage in 1⁶⁻¹¹ and Jeremiah's description of the 'Foe

¹ The writer considered that כְּיִצְרִים in 1⁶ had been wrongly punctuated, and that the word was originally pronounced כְּיִצְרִים *i.e.* 'like the Demons' or 'Demon-like,' which he regarded as an epithet of the Scythians.

² Cf. esp. 4¹³, 5¹⁵, 17^b, 6²³.

from the North' in chs. 4-6,¹ and concluded that the book of Habakkuk really comprised two oracles. The first oracle, which announced the invasion of the Scythians, contained 1¹⁻¹⁴ (vv. 15-17 not genuine); 2¹⁻³, 3^{16, 17}; while the second oracle which refers to Judah's deliverance, was understood to comprise 3^{1, 2}; 2⁴⁻²⁰ (vv. 12-14, 17^b not genuine), 3³⁻⁷; 3^{15, 8-14, 18, 19}. The view, as we have said, found no support among scholars, and even if the supposed reference to the Scythians was possible, his reconstruction of the text does not produce really two consistent oracles, and is, moreover, quite arbitrary. The same may be said, though perhaps to a less degree, of the view expressed by de Goeje in 1861. This scholar, while leaving it an open question as to who the foe is that is announced by the prophet, agreed nevertheless with von Gumpach's division into two prophecies:—the first prophecy = 1¹⁻⁴; 2¹⁻³; 1⁵⁻¹¹; 3^{16, 17}; and the second prophecy = 3²; 1¹²⁻¹⁷; 2⁴⁻²⁰ (vv. 12-14 not genuine and text corrupt); 3^{3-7, 15, 8-14, 18, 19}. The reconstruction is better than that of von Gumpach but not less arbitrary, and in either case it would be difficult to conceive how such a confusion in the present text arose. Both these views are in fact only of interest as showing the first critical attempts in connection with the study of this prophecy.

The first real exponent of what we term the

¹ These chapters in Jeremiah in all probability referred originally to the Scythians.

'two-oracle' theory¹ was Giesebrecht. In 1890 *Giesebrecht*, in his *Beiträge zur Jesaiakritik* (p. 197f.) Giesebrecht expressed the view that the passage 1⁵⁻¹¹ is really an oracle complete in itself, which is out of place in its present context, and refers to a time anterior to the events implied in 1^{2ff}. He started from the view, which had already been expressed by Wellhausen in 1873, that the 'wicked' and the 'righteous' mentioned in 1⁴ are naturally identical with the 'wicked' and 'righteous' referred to in 1¹³; in the latter verse the 'wicked' are clearly the Chaldeans; and therefore it was argued 1²⁻⁴ must be understood to refer not to social wrongs within the state but to the violence which Judah was suffering at the hands of the same foe. In this case 1⁵⁻¹¹ are clearly out of place, for there the Chaldeans are but announced while in the rest of the chapter their tyranny and violence are spoken of as having already continued for some time. Accordingly Giesebrecht was led to infer that Habakkuk's original oracle was simply 1^{1-4, 12-17}; 2¹⁻⁸,² which probably dated from the time of the exile, and to which 1⁵⁻¹¹ may have been added by the prophet as an introduction, its original place being before 1¹. A similar view was expressed by Wellhausen in 1892 (cf. *Kl. Proph.* pp. 161, 162), *Wellhausen,* and by Nowack in his commentary (*Kl. Proph.* *Nowack and Peake.*

¹ In what follows the term is only intended to refer to chs. 1 and 2 and not to ch. 3.

² Giesebrecht would reject apparently 2^{9ff}.

p. 269), and has been more recently advocated by Peake (*Problem of Suffering in the Old Testament*, p. 5 and p. 169).¹ Wellhausen and Nowack, however, would regard the original oracle as pre-exilic and not, like Giesebrecht, as dating from the time of the exile. This solution of the difficulties raised by 1^{2ff} may be commended for its simplicity, and has the further merit of bringing the opening verses into immediate connection with what forms the real subject of the oracle, namely, the violence and tyranny which the Chaldeans are exercising. But it is doubtful whether it can really be claimed as a satisfactory solution of the problem, though it must be admitted that of all the views which have hitherto been advanced, it would certainly appear to be the most satisfactory.² In the first place this view would not only reduce the original oracle to a very meagre dimension, but it would reduce it in part to what one might almost call a tautology. Thus in 1³

¹ Compare also Halévy (*Revue Sémitique* 1906) who adopts Giesebrecht's rearrangement of the text; and Staerk (*Das assyrische Weltreich im Urteil der Propheten*), who disconnects 1^{5,11} and refers it to the Scythians (about 630 B.C.); the rest of the prophecy is directed, he thinks, against the Assyrians.

² It is not perhaps directly subversive of this explanation that one of the chief arguments on which it is based, namely, the identification of רשע in 1⁴ and in 1¹³ may ultimately depend on what proves to be an erroneous punctuation in the Massoretic text; for, if—as would appear to be not unlikely (cf. pp. 161ff.)—‘wickedness’ (רָשָׁע) rather than ‘wicked’ (רָשָׁעִי) is the correct reading in 1⁴, the prophet might still be intending that ‘wickedness’ which the foe, alluded to in 1¹³, was perpetrating. Still it must be admitted that the force of the above argument would be somewhat lessened if this reading is correct.

the prophet already raises the question of Jehovah's attitude to evil and wrong, and complains of his apparent indifference, but on the above interpretation he does so again in all but the next verse. There is no doubt a slight difference—especially if אָנִי in v.³ is read for תָּנִיט—in the way in which the question is addressed,¹ and also it is no doubt true that, as this is the main point in his plea, he would naturally be expected to emphasise it; yet there is a difference between repeating practically the same thing in all but successive verses, and having recourse *after an interval* to the same thought in order to reiterate it and emphasise it afresh. The former is tautological and weak, the latter natural and emphatic. And, secondly, the statement that Jehovah has appointed the oppressor for judgment (1^{12b}) is somewhat intrusive. It is true, no doubt, that the prophet, as he reflected on the wrong and violence which were being perpetrated and thought of what Jehovah was, might feel assured that the oppressor had been appointed for judgment and that his nation would survive it, but this feeling of assurance is not such as would be *directly* suggested either by 1^{2,4} or by what follows in 1¹³. The clause is not prepared for, and, moreover, it would break the immediate connection which this view² postulates

¹ In 1³ the prophet asks why Jehovah should allow him to behold evil, while in 1¹² the question is why Jehovah Himself should behold evil.

² According to this interpretation, in 1^{12a} the emphasis is under-

between 1^{12a} and 1¹³. Nowack has recognised this and would accordingly regard 1^{12b} as a later addition. But this is arbitrary.¹ And, lastly, it would be a little difficult, on the supposition that the above view is correct, to account for the present position of 1⁵⁻¹¹ unless it be supposed that the arrangement is purely accidental, but even then the further difficulty is suggested as to why this independent oracle should have been brought into connection with the original oracle at all. It is scarcely adequate to say that the author of 1²⁻⁴, 1^{2ff} inserted it as an introduction, because there is no obvious reason why he should have done so, seeing that his readers would be quite familiar with the oppressor at whose wrongs and violence he was indignant. It would be better in that case to regard it as the insertion of a much later time; this, however, does not readily commend itself, as the passage—in spite of what Giesebrecht says—does not give the impression that it is an oracle complete in itself. It is rather incomplete and fragmentary in character and would therefore perhaps scarcely be selected as a fitting introduction to another

stood to be on the *holiness* of Jehovah—‘Art Thou not Israel’s Holy One from of old’—rather than on Jehovah’s unchangeable attitude to Israel, cf. Nowack, also Marti.

¹ On the other hand the clause is not only fully prepared for but is quite natural if we suppose that at least part of 1⁵⁻¹¹ had actually preceded 1¹²; and, as we have already seen, there is nothing in these verses which would suggest that the present arrangement of the text is at fault, at least so far as the connection of 1^{6b.11} and 1^{12ff} is concerned.

oracle.¹ For these reasons Giesebrecht's view cannot, in the opinion of the present writer, be deemed satisfactory. It has been rejected by Davidson and Driver, though on different grounds.

II. *The 'Fragmentary' or 'Composite' theory.*—Under this term those views are intended to be included, which would regard chs. 1 and 2 as a combination of several distinct utterances. The book is not thought of as forming a literary unit, but as possessing a fragmentary character. The two best known exponents of this view are W. B. *Stevenson*. Stevenson and Marti. Both these scholars, however, work on independent lines, and they differ for the most part in their view as to the component parts of these chapters.

In the *Expositor* for 1902 the former scholar made a new suggestion as to the contents and structure of chs. 1 and 2. He started with Giesebrecht's proposal to connect 1²⁻⁴ with 1^{12f}, but, unlike the latter scholar, admitted that only v. 1¹² and v. 1¹³ bear a close relation to vv. 2⁻⁴; the rest of the section, viz. vv. 14⁻¹⁷, is a continuation, not of v. 1¹³, but of vv. 5⁻¹¹.² As thus reconstructed, the chapter forms two distinct prophecies; 1²⁻⁴, 12⁻¹³, referring to the state of society towards the end of the seventh century; and 1⁵⁻¹¹, 14⁻¹⁷,

¹ It may, of course, have come into the hands of the editors as a mere isolated fragment for which they sought to find some fitting place in the prophetic writings. This, however, is not probable.

² In 1¹⁴ יעשה is to be read for תעשה in agreement with the 3rd persons of section 1⁵⁻¹¹: so also Rothstein and Nowack.

being a delineation of the Chaldeans and their conquests. The present position of vv. ¹² and ¹³ is ingeniously explained as due to their having fallen out on to the margin, and as having been subsequently replaced at the wrong point in the text. Ch. 2, in the opinion of the same writer, is similarly constructed. It, too, is composed of two distinct oracles. While fully admitting that 2²⁻⁴ have a close affinity with 1²⁻⁴, ¹²⁻¹³, yet, as 'it is difficult to account for the separation if this was the original sequence,' he would conjecture 2¹ to be editorial and 2²⁻³⁽⁴⁾ to be of the nature of a preface, possibly an introduction to vv. ⁵⁻⁸, which comprise the first main division of 2¹⁻¹⁷, and which predict either the overthrow of the Assyrian or the Chaldean. The remaining verses of ch. 2 (with the exception of redactional additions, viz. vv. ¹³, ¹⁴, ¹⁸⁻²⁰) form a second and distinct oracle, referring to the same condition of things as is implied in ch. 1²⁻⁴ and probably belonging to the same date. On this view then chs. 1 and 2 will comprise not one but four distinct oracles, which for the most part belong to different dates, though they are to be regarded as the work of one author. This solution for the problem of chs. 1 and 2, it must be admitted, is not very satisfactory; and there are several difficulties which are immediately suggested. (1) Though it is quite true, as the writer points out, that the literary writings of the prophets are composed of a series of oracles which

have been handed down for the most part without any logical order or coherency, yet the purpose for which each oracle has been uttered or written is as a rule quite intelligible. This, however, can hardly be said to be the case, if the section 1²⁻⁴, 12-13 is taken as a distinct oracle. In fact it cannot be regarded as an oracle at all. It would be a mere complaint which does not lead up to any announcement on the part of the prophet, nor would it be easy to see why indeed it should have been committed to writing at all. The same may be said of 1⁵⁻¹¹, for is it probable that the prophet should have left on record an announcement of the rise of the Chaldeans without pointing out the purpose which Jehovah had with them? No doubt this objection would be modified to some extent if 1⁵ (reading בונרים for M.T. בניים) was retained, but this verse Stevenson is inclined to regard as an editorial addition. (2) 1^{12b} would constitute a real difficulty; for, unless the clause be excised, there would be nothing to which the suffixes could refer; they cannot refer to the 'wicked' (v. 3), for, on the above view, these are not the heathen but the Judeans. (3) The excision of 2¹ as an editorial insertion is a violent measure. Nor is there any indication in the text that 2²⁻¹⁷ were ever intended to be regarded as two distinct oracles; if indeed certain of the 'woes' are felt to be inconsistent with the character of the 'woe' in vv. 6-8, it would seem to be far better to regard them as later additions

similar to vv. 13, 14, 18-20, than to attempt to form them into a separate oracle and regard them as being by the same author as vv. 2-8. This proposal, therefore, can hardly be said to commend itself, and so far as the present writer is aware, it has not met the acceptance of any scholar.

Marti. A somewhat similar view of the structure of chs. 1 and 2 has been put forward by Marti in his commentary on the minor prophets (*Das Dodekapropheten*, 1904). In this scholar's opinion chs. 1 and 2 are composed of three distinct sections—(1) a Psalm: 1²⁻⁴, 12a, 13, 21-4, in which the psalmist complains of the sufferings of the righteous at the hands of the wicked and receives the Divine assurance that judgment will not long be delayed. (2) A Prophecy: 1⁵⁻¹⁰, 14ff announcing the rise of the Chaldeans. (3) A series of 'woes': 2⁵⁻¹⁹ directed against the insatiable conduct of the Chaldeans; the section is not by the same author as (2) but was uttered at a late period, when the Chaldeans had already exercised their power for a considerable time. Marti would regard 1⁵⁻¹⁰, 14ff as the only genuine work of Habakkuk, while the psalm in 1²⁻⁴, 12a, 13 and 21-4 and 'the woes' in 2⁵⁻¹⁹ are respectively post-exilic and exilic productions. 1¹¹, 12b, 17 and 2²⁰ are to be regarded as glosses added at the time of the redaction of the book; and the present arrangement of the text is ingeniously explained by the supposition that, while sections (2) and (3) were connected at the end of the

exile, the psalm (1) was added at a still later time—when ‘man die alten Prophetenschriften anfang als Prophezeiungen der Ereignisse der letzten Zeiten zu betrachten und mit grösster Spannung den Eintritt des jüngsten Tages erwartete’¹—on the margin of the manuscript and then carelessly inserted into the text by a scribe. This view of the structure of the book is more consistent (cf. the connection of 1²⁻⁴, 12a, 13 with 2¹⁻⁴ and the omission of 1^{12b}) than the one we have just noticed, but it can hardly be said to be more satisfactory. If, as Marti and other scholars surmise, we should follow the LXX. in reading בִּנְיָרִים in 1⁵, the prophecy 1⁵⁻¹⁰, 14-16 may quite well be addressed to the faithless in Judah, but then we miss after v. 5 any explicit reference to them; nor would the prophet, on this view, show—at least explicitly—how the coming judgment would affect them. It is of course possible that they may be included in the general terms of vv. 14-16, still this would be somewhat surprising, as the prophet usually in such a description refers explicitly to the interests and welfare of his own nation. Moreover the excisions which this view involves for ch. 1 are arbitrary and violent; and the dislocation postulated for the psalm 1²⁻⁴, 12a, 13, 2¹⁻⁴ is, as Driver points out,² too improbable. Neither of these views, then, can be regarded as satisfactory, and though the latter of the two is, as we have said, preferable, yet it is improbable that it

¹ *Dodekaproph.* p. 330.

² *Cent. Bib.* p. 59.

will ever gain the same support, which the views of either Giesebrecht or Budde have acquired.

In this connection mention must be made also of the *Nicolardot*, view of Nicolardot, the latest contributor to the Book of Habakkuk (*La Composition du Livre d'Habacuc*, Paris, 1908). Nicolardot believes the book to be composed of four originally distinct pieces: namely two psalms: 1²⁻⁴, 13, 2⁴ and 3; and two prophecies—the one announcing the Chaldeans, 1⁵⁻¹⁰, 1¹⁴, 17, the other containing the 'woes' in 2^{5ff}. The oldest piece is 1⁵⁻¹⁰, 14, 17 (about 604 B.C.); while 2⁵⁻¹⁹ dates about 550 B.C. and is the only portion written by Habakkuk. The psalms were composed somewhere between the fifth and third centuries. This view, though ably argued, can scarcely be said to possess any advantage over the ones just considered, and it would be interesting to know the history of the preservation of 1⁵⁻¹⁰, 14, 17 and indeed of 2⁵⁻¹⁹ before the work of redaction began.

III. The 'Re-constructive' Theory.—We apply this designation especially to the theory which Budde of Marburg has put forward as to the structure of chs. 1 and 2; for, while maintaining for the most part the literary unity of these chapters, he has nevertheless so re-constructed them as to place upon them quite a different interpretation from that which they are *Budde*, generally understood to bear. In 1893 Budde in the *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* (pp. 383-393) expressed the view that the prophecy really speaks

not of one but of two foreign peoples. The violence and wrong to which the prophet refers in 1²⁻⁴ are those of a hostile people; but this people is to be vanquished in turn by another people (cf. 2⁸). This stronger people is the Chaldean, the other the Assyrian. On the basis of this Budde proceeded to reconstruct the present text; 1⁵⁻¹¹ are out of place; their real position is after 2²⁻⁴ and before 2⁵ (for וַאֲנִי וְאַתָּה כִּי-הָיִין is to be read with Bredenkamp, and in 1⁹⁻¹¹ for the imperfects consecutive, the simple imperfects) while 1^{12ff} are to be regarded as the proper continuation of 1²⁻⁴. The present dislocation of the passage which announced the rise of the Chaldeans arose in exilic or post-exilic times. It was seen that events had really falsified the hope which the prophecy held out; for the Chaldeans could hardly be regarded as instrumental in saving Israel; they were rather the latter's oppressors. Accordingly 'the prophecy was so transformed as to be capable of being interpreted by the fall of the Chaldeans' (*Encyc. Bib.* col. 1926). In 1895 Budde defended his view against Rothstein in an article in the *Expositor*, and has more recently advocated it afresh in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, and less fully in his *Geschichte der althebräischen Litteratur* (1906). That this theory of the structure of chs. 1 and 2 is both able and ingenious must be freely admitted; it has been accepted unconditionally by Cornill (*Einleitung*⁵, *Cornill*. p. 218 f.), by Sellin (*Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, *Sellin*.

p. 100) and also, though with some hesitation, by G. A. Smith, who makes the alternative suggestion that the oppressors may be the Egyptians (*The Book of the Twelve Prophets*, vol. ii. pp. 119 ff.).¹ It will, therefore, be necessary to review at some length the arguments which are advanced in its support. It is argued (1) that if the prophecy were directed against the Chaldeans, we should have expected to find Cyrus or the Medes mentioned by name as the instrument of Jehovah's justice or 'at the very least the announcement made that a warlike people should appear, even if no name were given.'² Now it is true that a prophet not infrequently in announcing the fall either of his own or some other nation refers to the instrument by which that fall is to be effected, compare for instance (among the examples quoted by Budde) Is. 13¹⁷ where it is the Medes whom it is said Jehovah will raise up against the Chaldeans, or again Is. 21² where we have both Elam and the Medes mentioned as the adversaries of the same power. And it is also true that, because the fate of a nation was usually determined by the power of another people, a prophet was naturally led to conclude that the same would happen in a case where, in predicting the coming fall of some power or other,

¹ It is adopted also by F. T. Kelly (*The Strophic structure of Habakkuk*, *AJS* L. xviii. p. 94 ff.); and compare Kent (*Sermons, Epistles and Apocalypses of Israel's Prophets*, p. 221), who, like Budde, transfers 1⁵⁻¹¹ to 2⁴ but thinks 1^{12b}, 14-17 follows on 1¹¹ and precedes 2⁵.

² *Encyc. Bib.* col. 1922, 3.

it was not clear by whom that fall would be effected. This is almost certainly the case in Is. 10⁶ where, in his prediction of the fall of Assyria, the prophet does not give the name of the people by whom the overthrow is to be accomplished, but simply states that it will be brought about 'by a profane nation.'¹ But it would be pressing the point in question too far to say that such a specification must *necessarily* be expected. If these chapters, as it is usually thought, date from the early years of the Chaldean movement, it is quite obvious that the prophet would have no certain knowledge as to how its progress would be checked and its power crippled. He could not possibly have thought of any one nation; he might have thought—as Isaiah thought in the case of Assyria—that it would be effected by some future people.² But in reality such details were to him quite a secondary matter; what he wanted to convey to his readers was not how or by whom the Chaldeans were to fall *but* the *assurance* that the proud attitude, which the Chaldeans were adopting, was fatal to their existence, and that, however much the righteous might dread their power, events would show (though the future was quite obscure) that

¹ At any rate the absence of any description of 'this profane people' would seem to show that at the time when the prophet wrote he had no special nation in view but was really making his statement in accordance with what events had invariably proved to be the case.

² This, however, is not certain, for from 2⁸ we might possibly infer that he hinted at an alliance of the nations.

faithful adherence to Jehovah was in reality the pledge of their own national safety. Budde's argument, therefore, hardly does justice to the prophet's main contention, and in reality amounts to nothing. It is urged (2) that the picture of the oppressor in 1^{14ff} and 2⁵ does not suit the Chaldeans but does suit the Assyrians. The writer says, 'Not all at once, but by numerous separate efforts spread over three centuries, not merely by force of arms, but (as the angling metaphor suggests) by policy and craft were so many petty principalities . . . swept into the hands of these robbers' (cf. Is. 10^{5-11, 13f}). The Chaldean, on the other hand, far from being the unrelenting, persistent, grasping amasser of wealth, was '*simply the smiling heir*.'¹ That the above description is a true estimate of the Assyrian victories no one will be disposed to dispute; and it may be fully admitted, further, that the picture in 1^{14ff}—at least at one period in the history of Assyria—would be very suitable to that power. But when Budde speaks of the Chaldean as '*simply the smiling heir*,' he is assuming more than he has historical evidence for; in fact what evidence there is at hand would directly point against such an assumption. It is probable that some time before the fall of the Assyrian Empire the Syrian states had practically gained their independence; at least this was so far the case that Egypt, just before the final attack on Nineveh,

¹ *Encyc. Bib.* col. 1923. The italics are the present writer's.

had succeeded in establishing itself in Syria. And when at last the Chaldeans *inherited* as their spoil the country to the south and west of the Tigris, *their claim had to be made good*. Egypt disputed it on Syrian soil and, though they were decisively defeated at Carchemish, yet we are not thereby to conclude that the Syrian and Palestinian states directly acknowledged the Chaldean sovereignty. We do not know the exact course events took, but we do know that Judah did not submit until Nebuchadrezzar 'came up,' and it is reasonable to infer that there would be many of the states in Syria and Palestine that would show similar opposition, even though, as is probable, they were easily brought under the rule of the new power. But does the description in i^{14ff} give the impression that the conquest of the peoples was effected not with ease but by long-sustained endeavour, not 'all at once' but by 'numerous separate efforts spread over three centuries'? To this question there is but one answer that the present writer can return, and that a negative one. When in v.^{13b} the prophet speaks of the 'wicked as *swallowing up* those that are more righteous than themselves,' and then, again, in vv.^{14ff} compares men to fishes which are '*wholly taken up*' and 'swept along with the drag' and 'gathered,' it seems difficult to resist the impression that (as against Budde) both the rapidity and ease of the conqueror are intended to be emphasised in these verses. The

angling metaphor in 1^{15f}, as Budde suggests, may indeed denote the crafty policy of the conqueror, yet it is quite as probable to suppose that it is intended here to convey the more general idea of the all-sweeping way in which the subjugation of the different peoples was effected. The description in vv. 13^{b ff}, then, so far from being inapplicable to the Chaldeans, would admirably suit the ease and swiftness with which they apparently succeeded in establishing their supremacy over the Syrian and Palestinian communities. But Budde objects (3) that 'even if the Chaldean ascendancy did come to partake of the character described, Judah at all events had no time allowed her to experience it.' Between 602 [the year in which Budde places Jehoiakim's rebellion] and 597 B.C. 'the prophecy [indeed] might conceivably have been directed against the Chaldeans,' but then 'this short interval is hardly long enough to account for such a picture as we have in 1^{14ff}.' ¹ The objection, it will be noticed, involves two suppositions. It supposes (1) that Judah has actually experienced the oppression of which the prophet speaks, and (2) that such a description is hardly possible before the siege of Jerusalem in 597 B.C. But the first supposition is only a supposition and Budde has yet to *prove* that the prophecy speaks of any oppression of Judah. On the contrary we have seen reason for believing that the reverse is the case, and that the prophet

¹ *Encyc. Bib.* col. 1923.

is simply alluding to the oppression of the peoples (cf. esp. v. ^{13b} where, in the phrase צָדִיק מִמֶּנִּי, a reference to Judah seems purposely excluded by the addition of מִמֶּנִּי, cf. p. 17). While the second supposition that the description is hardly possible of the Chaldean before 597 B.C. presupposes a knowledge of the period for which there is not only no evidence but which does not seem probable in the light of what information there is at hand. For if what we have said above is true with regard to the submission of the Syrian and Palestinian states, this in itself would be surely quite sufficient to account not only for the prophet's picture of the Chaldean in 1^{14f} but for that in 1⁶⁻¹¹ as well.¹ Again it is difficult to see how any satisfactory argument (4) can be based on the fact that 'the strong personification of the enemy in the image of the fisher' would be 'very appropriate in the case of the Assyrian, who are always designated by the singular Aššur,' but would 'not fit in with the plural Kašdim nearly so well.'² For if in vv. ⁶⁻¹¹ the prophet refers to the Chaldean throughout in the singular, why should he not have continued to do so in vv. ^{14ff}? Especially as the image of the fisher, as

¹ Budde further remarks that 'within these years (*i.e.* 602-597) a prophecy of the fall of the Chaldean power would certainly have been most premature.' But as we have seen this is to mistake the prophet's purpose. All that he wishes to emphasise is that the *character* of the conqueror will sooner or later mean his fall, without definitely specifying how or by whom that fall will be brought about.

² *Encyc. Bib.* col. 1923, 4.

we have seen, may just as suitably be employed with reference to the Chaldean as to the Assyrian. Lastly it is argued (5) that the series of 'woes' in 2⁶⁻¹⁷ (vv. 12-14, 18-20 are to be regarded as later additions) favour an application to the Assyrian rather than to the Chaldean. But, as Davidson remarks, 'there is little in them that favours one application more than another';¹ and the same writer points out that the charge of 'spoiling' all nations (vv. 6-8) is also made by the author of Is. 14 (cf. vv. 6, 12, 16); while that of contemptuous humiliation of conquered nations is—he rightly urges—one that might be directed against any conqueror (cf. Jer. 51⁷). The reference, too, to the violence done to Lebanon (cf. 2¹⁷) may be paralleled from Is. 14⁸, and, when we remember that it is not unlikely that the Chaldean army made their headquarters at Riblah not long after the battle of Carchemish,² the circumstances implied in v. 17 would receive a natural setting. The charge made in vv. 9-11 may not be quite so clear; but even if it is to be understood more or less literally (which, however, is not probable, comp. above on ch. 2), then it must not be left unnoticed that the inscriptions testify largely to Nebuchadrezzar's building operations, to the fortifications, palaces and temples reared by

¹ *Camb. Bib.* p. 54.

² Cf. 2 K. 25⁶, etc. where at a later time at any rate Nebuchadrezzar is said to have had his headquarters. Comp. p. 49 note.

him.¹ The charges made, therefore, in this section (vv. 6-17) would hardly be determinative.

The above arguments, then, which Budde adduces in favour of his interpretation of chs. 1 and 2, will be seen, on a close consideration, scarcely to carry conviction; and there is a tendency at times rather to overlook the fact that our knowledge of the history of the years preceding the investment of Jerusalem is really very meagre; it is probable that much, which otherwise suggests a difficulty, would, on fuller light, become quite natural. There are, moreover, one or two considerations which argue strongly against Budde's views of these chapters. He refers, as we have seen, 1²⁻⁴, 12-17 to Assyrian oppression, but would it be possible to speak of Assyria as really aggressive in the middle of Josiah's reign? ² What we know of the history of Assyria at this period would certainly seem far from supporting such a statement. Towards the end of the reign of Ashurbanipal (who died in 625) Assyria was overrun by the Scythians, and since that time revolt succeeded revolt, which shook the empire to its very foundations; its resources were considerably weakened, and

¹ Comp. Goodspeed, *A History of the Babylonians and Assyrians*, pp. 342 ff.

² Budde would interpret 'Torah' in 1⁴ as referring to the Deuteronomic code, and would accordingly place the date of the oracle after 621 but before Josiah's death in 609. The 'righteousness claimed in v. 4 and v. 13,' he says, 'is the will for good produced by this law, the promulgation of which was accompanied by such high hopes.' Perhaps 615 or earlier would be the approximate date, cf. *Encyc. Bib.* col. 1924.

its decline rapid. In view of this it is scarcely conceivable that Assyria could have any real hold on its dependent states ; and in the records of Josiah's reign there is not the slightest hint that the nation was at that time oppressed by the Assyrian power. Moreover the fact that Josiah was able to set in movement the plan of Reformation, and even extend it beyond the confines of Judah, would strongly suggest that the country was not trammelled by foreign oppression. This is a serious objection to Budde's view, and, as Peake remarks,¹ it is to be regretted that he does not deal directly with it in his later articles in the *Encyclopædia Biblica* and the *Geschichte der althebräischen Litteratur*. And, further, the description in 1⁶⁻¹¹ creates the impression that the writer is describing the Chaldeans as he then knew them rather than drawing a somewhat imaginary picture of that people based on his knowledge of the Scythian hordes.² But in this case the fortunes of the Chaldean in 615 B.C.³ would hardly be known to the prophet, nor is it probable that he would have any clear insight into the part which they were destined to play in the history of the following decades. The way in which the nation is described in these verses is most naturally explained on the view that they

¹ *The Problem of Suffering in Old Testament*, p. 158.

² Comp. *Encyc. Bib.* col. 1926.

³ Budde's approximate date of the prophecy.

latter passage, but otherwise it will hardly, it is thought, meet with approval. For, among other reasons, it is at least doubtful whether, as Hoonacker would urge, the proposed rendering in 2³ does in reality give the sense intended by the prophet. If the prophet had meant that Jehovah had still another vision to give, it is almost certain he would have expressed himself differently, and not in the ambiguous way which this view would imply, especially as in 2² it would have been so easy for him to have written some such phrase as 'and Jehovah *again* answered and said'; while, in spite of what might be urged to the contrary, the emphasis in 2^{3aβ} and b on the certainty of the vision's realisation is most naturally prepared for, not by a statement that 'there is *yet* a vision for a fixed time' (with emphasis alone on 'yet'), but by a statement that the realisation of the vision, which is about to be given, lies *still in the future* (with emphasis both on עַד and on לְמוֹעֵד, the לְמוֹעֵד re-affirming what is implied by עַד). Moreover, to suppose that in 1²⁻⁴, 12ff the prophet immediately raises a complaint in view of the announcement which he has just made of the impending Chaldean invasion is hardly probable. In fact such a procedure on the part of the prophet would be without parallel in Old Testament prophecy. A prophet in making a pronouncement in Jehovah's name¹ does not

¹ Hoonacker would suppose that at the beginning of 1⁵ there stood originally the formula: 'Thus saith Jehovah.' Comp. *Petits Prophètes*, p. 458.

dissociate himself from the message he gives and expostulate with Jehovah for what He has predicted, but, on the contrary, speaks as His representative and seeks to interpret and justify that pronouncement in the light of the circumstances in which he lives. Nor does, it may be added, the fact that the proposed solution rests in part on a *conjectural* text (unsupported by the versions) tend to command confidence.

IV. *The 'Redactional' Theory.*—In the year following that in which Budde first published his view there appeared in the same magazine an article by Rothstein of Halle. The purpose of the article was to show that Hab. 1 and 2 had reached their present form through a somewhat considerable redactional *Rothstein.* process. Starting from the fact that 1²⁻⁴ show a close similarity to the circumstances of Jeremiah's age and are accordingly to be referred to the opposition between the righteous and ungodly in Judah, and accepting the further conclusion that the Chaldeans are to be the instrument in effecting the divine punishment, Rothstein found a difficulty to this sequence in thought at 1¹¹. 'The ~~is~~ at the beginning of [this verse] transports us to a later time than that in which we find ourselves in the preceding section.' The storm of judgment, which was threatened, has passed, and the Chaldean has exceeded his work as the instrument of Divine wrath. Verses 1^{12b} and 1^{14ff} show that this has

already happened or is at least in process of execution. In view of this and 'through a series of observations on the text as well as through not a few analogies elsewhere in the Old Testament' the writer was led 'to explain the strange form of the prophecy as due to the fact that an older prophecy had been worked over by a later hand, and its purpose transposed.' Instead of being simply directed against the godlessness prevalent within Judah, the older prophecy was so expanded as to become a prophecy against Babylon. On the basis of this conclusion, as well as on the further supposition that the redactor depended on older prophetic writings, especially those of Isaiah, for his material, Rothstein attributed to the work of redaction—the present position of 1⁶⁻¹⁰, which he thinks originally came after 2^{5a}; 1^{5a} (comparing Is. 5^{12b} and 29⁹); 1¹¹ (comparing Is. 21¹ and 10^{5ff}); 1^{12b} (a re-echo of Is. 10^{6,7}); 1^{15b,16,17}; 2^{5b} (cf. Is. 5¹⁴); 2^{6a} (cf. Is. 14⁴); 2⁸; 2^{10ba} (קצות ע' ר'); 2^{12,14} (cf. v. 12 with Mic. 3¹⁰; v. 14 with Is. 11^{9b}); 2^{15,16} (both verses partially redactional); 2¹⁷; 2²⁰. The original and older oracle would then comprise: 1^{2-4,12a,13}; 2^{1-5a}; 1⁶⁻¹⁰, 1¹⁴ (reading ויעשה, 1^{5a}; 2^{6b,7}; 2⁹⁻¹¹ (except קצות ע' ר'); 2^{15,16} (partially); 2^{19,18}.

This view of the prophecy has been worked out on consistent and definite principles, and shows a keen insight into the literary writings of the time. But it will no doubt be felt that it is too elaborate, and the redactional process, through which it pre-

supposes these chapters to have passed, too extensive in character to command for it much probability. For it is intrinsically improbable that any editor would have re-edited an older oracle so minutely, and transformed it so thoroughly, as Rothstein would suppose; it would be in reality to attribute to him all the acuteness and insight of the modern critic. The editor of Old Testament times, on the contrary, contented himself with making some slight changes or additions rather than set himself to transform an earlier prophecy in any complete and drastic way. Moreover the connection which this view postulates for the different sections of the older oracle is, in one or two places at least, very unlikely. Neither the connection of 2^{5a} with 1⁶, in spite of a manifestly corrupt text, nor that of 1^{15a} with 2^{6b} can be pronounced satisfactory; in both cases the transition is abrupt. But, while the above view has so far met with no acceptance, its merits should not be overlooked. Rothstein would seem—at least to the present writer—to work on right lines, when he seeks to explain the difficulties, which these chapters present, as due to redaction, although the way in which he has applied this view can scarcely be deemed satisfactory. And also he has done good service in showing the affinity which these chapters bear to the writings of Isaiah,¹ though in this case too he would

¹ In some of the above cases, however, it must be admitted that the resemblance is somewhat superficial.

appear to go wrong in attributing it to the redactor rather than to the prophet himself.

V. Lastly, we may consider those theories, advanced in recent years, which, while regarding the book of Habakkuk as forming more or less a literary unit, nevertheless place upon it quite a different *interpretation* from that which it is ordinarily understood to possess. This section will comprise the views of Lauterburg, Happel, Betteridge, Peiser and Duhm. Of the theories which these scholars respectively advocate, that of Prof. Betteridge will claim first consideration, not only because it is the most probable of them, but because it represents a definite attempt to arrive at a consistent view of the book *as it stands, without any serious alteration in the text*. In the *American Journal of Theology* for October 1903 Prof. Betteridge expressed the view that the prevalency of oppression and strife, of which the prophet complains in 1²⁻⁴, and the tyranny, which is seen to be exercised over other nations as well (1^{13ff}), are due neither in the one case to social disorder nor in the other to the Chaldeans, but both to the presence of the Assyrian. The Chaldeans are not the subject or the occasion of the prophecy; they are simply the instrument in Jehovah's hand for punishing the oppressor (*i.e.* Assyria). In this Betteridge agrees with Budde, but disagrees with the latter, in that he would see no need for the transposition of 1⁵⁻¹¹ to the end of 2⁴. 'To make the description,'

the writer says, 'culminate in the glorification of any human power is to distort the picture and misinterpret the religious philosophy of the prophet. His prediction . . . is based upon his conception of the justice and righteousness of Jehovah . . . the human agency is not ignored but given a subordinate place . . . and is introduced early so that it may not detract from the force of the conception of Jehovah's justice and power with which the prophecy culminates.' A different date is also advocated. Whereas Budde would place the composition of the prophecy about 615 B.C., Betteridge thinks that the conditions best suit the invasion of Sennacherib in 701 B.C., and points out that it was just at this period that the Chaldeans were more prominent than at any later time till they came forward at the fall of Assyria. Merodach Baladan had held the Babylonian throne from 720 to 709 B.C., when he was defeated by Sargon; but he again came to the front under Sennacherib, probably inducing other dependencies to join his rebellion. The revolt was quelled; and Sennacherib then turned his attention to Palestine and succeeded in besieging Hezekiah at Jerusalem; but he had to raise the siege, perhaps as Betteridge suggests, owing to another uprising on the part of Merodach Baladan. This latter suggestion would necessitate a second expedition by Sennacherib into Judah, but it is a view which is held by eminent scholars, and may

be correct. At any rate it is to the time of the siege of Jerusalem that Betteridge would refer the book of Habakkuk, and the author would be, therefore, a contemporary of Isaiah, perhaps the associate and pupil of the latter prophet. This date has a distinct advantage over Budde's, in that it places the prophecy actually when the Assyrians were known to be oppressing Judah and the other States. But, otherwise, it is doubtful whether the suggested interpretation is really an improvement on that of Budde. For (1) it is not obvious why the prediction of Assyria's fall should be definitely associated with a revolt on the part of Merodach Baladan in 701 B.C. The revolt may no doubt have been an extensive one, but there does not seem to be any reason why the prophet should have predicted from this the fall of the Assyrian empire, especially as Merodach Baladan had already before revolted and had already failed. Moreover (2) if this were the case, it is remarkable that Isaiah is silent; it is true he predicts the fall of Assyria, but he never directly attributes it to the Chaldean; and, on the occasion in question, all that he would seem to have predicted is that Sennacherib would 'hear a rumour,' cf. Is. 37⁶. (3) The description in 1⁶⁻¹⁰ suggests the approach of an 'enemy towards Judah, or at any rate towards the region in which the prophet lived rather than a description of an invasion by Assyria, cf. esp. v. ⁸ 'they come from afar' and v. ⁹ 'all of them come for

violence. And lastly (4) the present position of 1⁵⁻¹¹ on this view would tend to spoil the symmetry of the chapter and interrupt the prophet's address. We should certainly in this case, with Budde, have expected these verses to have followed at the end of 2⁴, or to have at least been brought into connection with the answer given in the latter passage. It is not sufficient to say that it is introduced early that it may not detract from 'the force of the conception of Jehovah's justice and power with which the prophecy culminates,' especially if (as Betteridge supposes) ch. 3 is to be regarded as an integral part of the book. Moreover, in 1⁵⁻¹¹ the rise of the Chaldean is directly attributed to Jehovah, so that, quite apart from ch. 3, the force of the remark would not be at all obvious. That the Assyrians are the oppressor spoken of in these chapters is also the opinion of F. E. Peiser, *Peiser*, who, in the same year, published a monograph in the *Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft*. Noticing a similarity between certain passages in the book of Habakkuk and the Assyrian literature, Peiser came to the conclusion that the author must have been intimate with that literature, and had studied it in its own language. And, as there was nothing in these chapters which would point definitely to the fact that the author lived in Jerusalem, he made the further inference that he was really a resident in Nineveh. Support for this inference is found in 3¹⁶, where the LXX. render the difficult words לעלות לעם יגרו

by τοῦ ἀναβῆναι εἰς λαὸν παροικίας μου, reading apparently לעם מגורי 'against the people of my sojourning,' for M.T. לעם יגדנו. The author sees oppression threatening the people among whom he dwells as a stranger. This people must be different from those whom Jehovah, according to 3¹³, went forth to help. They cannot be, therefore, the people of Jerusalem but those of another city, who had been once¹ attacked by the Chaldeans and were now in danger of being conquered. This would point to Nineveh shortly before its conquest by the Medes. Peiser thinks the author was probably a Jewish prince,² and sees a reference to him in 'the anointed' of 3¹³. He would also suppose that the 'right' spoken of in 1⁴ is his claim to the throne of Judah. The prophecy is not earlier than 609 B.C., and was perhaps occasioned by the news of Josiah's death.

With the exception of the parallels from Assyrian literature, it will be seen that Peiser bases his view almost entirely on evidence derived from ch. 3, this

¹ This would perhaps be in 625 when the Medes, probably in alliance with the Chaldeans, made an attack in which the Median chief fell.

² He had probably in his youth been taken as a hostage on one of the occasions of the rebellions, and may have been a son or grandson of Manasseh. The 'house of the wicked' in 3¹³ must be Assyria; and the chief or 'head' Peiser conjectures to be Madyas, the leader of the Scythians, who endeavoured to bring relief to Nineveh on the advance of the Medes. Madyas was the son of Bartatua and grandson of Esarhaddon.

chapter being allowed to determine the interpretation of chs. 1 and 2. This is the reverse of the method which criticism has hitherto adopted ; and it is a precarious procedure, for it is, at the least, doubtful whether chs. 1 and 2 originally stood in connection with ch. 3 ; and it is a still more precarious procedure to construct practically the whole of a solution on a LXX. rendering of an admittedly corrupt text, especially when that reading is not accepted by the majority of scholars. But other objections may be urged : (1) it is not probable that a Scythian leader (cf. footnote, p. 98) would be described as 'head of the Assyrian house,' even though he was connected with the latter. It might be otherwise if he had actually commanded the Assyrian forces, but he did not ; he simply led the Scythians when they endeavoured to bring relief to the city. (2) It is not likely that the author would have simply regarded the Chaldeans as the people who would effect the fall of Assyria. We should have expected at least a reference to the Medes. This might be excusable on the part of a writer who lived at some distance from the scene of activity, but not in the case of one who actually resided at Nineveh. (3) If the author is 'the anointed,' the people in 3¹³ will *naturally* be those who, like him, are prisoners in Nineveh ; but so far as we know there never occurred any actual deportation from Judah to Assyria, such as the term 'thy people' (on this view) would imply. (4) The extreme correction of the

present text (cf. *op. cit.* pp. 27 ff.), which Peiser advocates, will hardly command confidence ; especially as the writer does not scruple to cut out, as glosses, clauses which are adverse to his own theory.¹ And, lastly, (5) Peiser does not specify exactly the way in which he would understand the *connection* between the sections in ch. 1. One thing, however, is certain, his view (cf. esp. 1⁵ and 1⁶⁻¹⁰) would not solve the critical problem which this chapter raises.

The theory, then, though ingenious, is for the above reasons quite improbable ; while the Assyrian parallels, which he adduces, may, as Peiser himself would appear to admit (cf. *op. cit.* p. 10), be capable of a different explanation.

So far the different theories that we have considered have not differed very widely as to the period in which the prophecy is to be placed. They have suggested either the Assyrian or the Chaldean periods, the later monarchical or exilic times. But now we turn to two views which would suppose the book of Habakkuk to be entirely a late post-exilic work. In *Happel*. 1900 Dr. Otto Happel expressed the view that the Habakkuk prophecy does not really refer to the Chaldeans ; but that this people is only typical for the enemy who is to rise up at the time of the messianic age. The oracle is not primarily historical.

¹ For instance in 1⁴ which Peiser reads כִּי רָשָׁע מִכְתִּיר אֶת הַצְדִּיק and dismisses the reference to *Torah* ; for its insertion would be opposed to the particular meaning assigned to מִיִּשְׁפָּט, viz. right to the throne.

but eschatological. One of the principal arguments in support of this view is that, while the victims of the oppressor are called 'the righteous' (*i.e.* the people identical with the prophet), in 1¹⁴ they are called 'men' and in 1¹⁷ 'the peoples.' On the other hand, in 2⁵ the 'Chaldeans' are identified with 'the peoples,' as they are there spoken of as 'gathering to themselves' all the peoples; but in 2⁶ they are again differentiated. Thus 'all the peoples' are found on both sides.¹ This representation is to be explained by the eschatological picture which represents a powerful enemy rising up at the time of the messianic age and seducing all the nations into war against the righteous (*i.e.* Israel). But on the fall of this seducing enemy, all the nations turn and join themselves to the latter people.² The historical background of the prophecy is to be found in post-exilic times, for (1) the nation is called 'righteous' *i.e.* free from idolatry, etc., which could not be predicated of Judah in pre-exilic times, not even in Josiah's reign; and (2) 2¹³ is a quotation from Jer. 51⁵⁸; and (3) in 1⁹ we have, the writer thinks, the remark of a glossator who evidently understood the enemy to have come from the west. This latter statement would indicate the Greek period; and in fact, Dr. Happel believes that the circumstances of the book best suit the beginning of the Syrian oppression, *i.e.* the reign of

¹ Cf. *Das Buch des Propheten Habakkuk*, p. 3.

² For the picture the writer compares Is. 14^{4ff}, Rev. 20^{7ff}.

Antiochus IV. cir. 170 B.C.¹ This view of the book of Habakkuk, it is thought, will scarcely commend itself, in spite of the somewhat lengthy and detailed treatment which Dr. Happel has bestowed upon it. For there is nothing in the book which would *definitely* suggest an eschatological interpretation. The reference to 'the end' and 'the appointed time' (ch. 2)—terms which, it is true, are familiar in apocalyptic pictures—as well as the theophany in ch. 3, which might possibly suggest such an interpretation, are capable of quite a different, and indeed simpler, explanation; while the argument that the nations are represented first on the side of 'the Chaldeans' and then on the side of the 'righteous' rests, it would seem, on a mistaken view of **1**¹³ (**צָדִיק מִמֶּנּוּ**); for there 'the righteous' are not Israel but 'those who have more right on their side than the oppressor.' But even if this were not the case, **2**⁶ would not by any means necessarily imply the interpretation which the writer would place on the phrases 'collect' and 'gather.'

The arguments also, which are adduced for a post-exilic date of the book, are equally indcisive. The

¹ Happel interprets chs. 1 and 2 as follows:—**1**²⁻⁴, the prophet laments the oppression which he *sees in the spirit*; **1**⁵⁻¹¹ gives God's answer, the oppressor will certainly come but will finally fall (on **1**¹¹ cf. p. 31); **1**¹²⁻¹⁷, the prophet expresses his confidence; but still fear outweighs and he cannot yet fully enter into God's plan. In **2**^{1ff}, after waiting God's answer, he is bidden to bring to public notice the answer given in **1**⁵⁻¹¹; trust will be the righteous' means of deliverance; to this is added as a further ground for comfort that punishment will soon befall the oppressor.

title 'righteous' cannot simply be regarded as a post-exilic term. 'The claim to righteousness is really a claim to be worshippers of the true God' (Davidson), and as such could be made in pre-exilic times; nor does the term necessarily imply that the nation as a whole was free from idolatry, for there was always a portion of the people who were at least conscious that they were faithful followers of Jehovah, even though the rest had lapsed into apostasy, and it would be easy for any of the former, while speaking in the name of the nation, instinctively to speak of Israel as 'righteous.' The quotation (2¹³), to which Dr. Happel refers, may be neither original here nor in Jer. 51⁵⁸ but proverbial (cf. p. 38n.); while to rest an argument on an admittedly corrupt text (1⁹) is, at the least, precarious. The interpretation, moreover, which this view necessitates for chs. 1 and 2 (cf. footnote, p. 102) is very artificial.

A still more extravagant view of the book has been advocated by Bernard Duhm (*Das Buch Duhm. Habakuk*, 1906). According to Duhm the book is composed of six poems, viz. 1²⁻⁴; 1⁵⁻¹¹; 1¹²⁻¹⁷; 2¹⁻³; 2^{4a}, 5-12, 13b, 17, 15, 16 and 3²⁻¹⁶. These poems are closely connected with each other and treat of the same subject. They do not, however, refer to the Chaldeans; the reading הַבְּשָׂרִים in 1⁶ has been inserted or corrected by the editor or scribes. In support of this it is urged that there is nothing in the whole of the book which compels us to think of that people, while there are several considerations which directly forbid

it. Thus it is argued:—(1) That the people must have appeared quite unexpectedly on the stage of history, for though the prophet says much about them, he is nevertheless filled with alarm and astonishment, cf. 1⁵. But in the seventh century the Chaldeans were a people which had been for a long time known to the Jews, nor could it be a matter of surprise that it divided the Assyrian heritage with the Medes. (2) That the people are ‘fierce’ and ‘terrifying’; but this is not the description of the Chaldean which is found in Jeremiah, Baruch, Ezekiel. Only after the fall of Jerusalem and the deportation of the people were they judged cruel, cf. Is. 14^{4ff} Ps. 137, but no one could speak of them in this way about 604 B.C. The people are, further, said to be quick; but the Chaldeans were very slow. (3) That the conqueror is represented as excessively wicked, but one who had experienced the Assyrian yoke and also Judah’s submission could not *cir.* 604 B.C. have spoken of the Chaldeans as ‘wicked,’ especially when they set about clearing Palestine of the Egyptians. And (4) that the conqueror marched on his expedition from west to east; but the Chaldeans from east to west. On the ground of these and other minor¹ arguments Duhm would suppose that not כַּשְׂרִים but כְּתִים or כְּתִיִּים, i.e. the Macedonians of the time of Alexander the Great, is the original reading. The latter people

¹ Comp. *Buch Hab.* p. 5. But the objections stated rest solely on a particular interpretation.

marched from the west eastward, and would, it is urged, suit the above description. The period, accordingly, to which the poems most probably refer, will be the years 334-331 B.C., 1⁵⁻¹¹ being understood to relate not to what is future but to what is present and past. Duhm is not the first scholar who has eliminated the reading הַבְּשִׁרִים, Lauterburg (*Theol. Zeitsch. Lauterburg. aus der Schweiz*, 1896)¹ had already proposed its excision on the basis of the reading of the LXX. MS.A. and referred 1⁵⁻¹¹ to the Persians, assigning the oracle to the later exilic period. But both in case of this latter supposition and that of Duhm the dismissal of בְּשִׁרִים is an extreme measure; and it is not easy to see any real reason why, if 'Kittim' had been original, the word should have been changed into 'the Chaldeans.' The above arguments, moreover, which Duhm adduces in support of his view are far from convincing, nor does the somewhat dogmatic way in which they are set forth tend to inspire confidence. In the first place is it so clear that the Chaldeans would not have caused the alarm and astonishment to which 1⁵ apparently alludes? It is true that the Chaldeans had for a long time been known to the Jews and that in 607 or 606 B.C. it must have become evident that Assyria would ultimately fall before the combined forces of the Medes and Chaldeans; but it is quite a different matter whether *Judah* had for any

¹ For a criticism of Lauterburg's view comp. Nicolardot, *Composition du Livre Hab.* p. 45 ff.; and Marti, p. 338 f.

length of time *anticipated* that the Chaldeans would actually coerce the Syrian and Palestinian states into submission. The battle of Carchemish was no doubt seen to be inevitable, because the Egyptians had assumed a threatening attitude, but we cannot with confidence assert that Judah ever thought its position would be endangered by the Chaldean power, especially as in the past the latter had shown a friendly attitude towards the Syrian states rather than the reverse. In any case it is not *necessary* to suppose that the alarm, of which the prophet speaks, was due to a new people having appeared on the stage of history, for it might equally be due to a well-known people having assumed a different rôle. Secondly, the argument that the character which is attributed to the Chaldeans in 1⁶⁻⁸ is not borne out by the description in Jeremiah (Baruch) or Ezekiel would seem to be contradicted by Jer. 4-6, Ez. 20⁴⁻⁵, 21 and 7, cf. also 26^{7ff}, which, if they do not literally speak of them as 'fierce' and 'terrifying,' nevertheless, certainly *imply* it; nor would the information we have of the events of the years 605-597 B.C. warrant the inference that their movements were slow. The third argument, to which we have referred above, may stand good only if what Duhm says represents the whole truth of the situation; but a consideration of the period would tend to show that it does not. The Chaldeans did not merely content themselves with driving out the Egyptians, they

sought to bring the Syrian and Palestinian states into submission, including Judah ; and though the absence of any detailed record concerning the Chaldean movement for these early years forbids us to dogmatize, yet the strong attitude adopted against them in this book would certainly not appear inconsistent with such information as we have at hand. The further suggestion that the enemy referred to came from the west rests on a conjectural rendering of the text ; and it is not at all clear that it was the writer's intention to state the *direction* from which the conqueror marched (cf. *Notes on Heb. Text*, p. 175). The late date, moreover, which this view would presuppose is not probable ; for we should hardly expect to meet with the language of an Isaiah at so late a period.¹ Nor is the literary structure advocated natural and clear.

Our criticism of the main theories, which have been put forward in view of the difficulties which the first two chapters of Habakkuk suggest, is now concluded ; and though there would not seem to be any particular view which we can pronounce quite satisfactory and which—with the exception of those of Giesebrecht and Budde—has gained so far, it will be seen, any weighty support, yet it is not from this to be concluded that the above proposals have not severally contributed something towards a more thorough knowledge of the book. We notice, on the one hand, the tendency

¹ The same is true of Happel's view.

to bring into close connection sections 1²⁻⁴ and 1^{12ff}, treating them both as part of the one and the same plea, as well as the tendency to understand not 1^{5ff} but 2^{1ff} as introducing Jehovah's answer ; and, on the other hand, the general desire to maintain section 1⁵⁻¹¹ as an integral part of the prophecy. Less general but not less important, also, is the suggestion to regard at least part of 1¹⁴⁻¹⁷ as closely connected with 1⁶⁻¹¹. What is required is some explanation which will embrace these different elements of truth without at the same time either postulating any considerable re-arrangement of the text or disturbing the literary unity of the chapters. It is only when this is done that we can hope for a satisfactory solution of the problem.

§ 5. THE PRAYER OF HABAKKUK.

In the preceding pages no account has been taken of the psalm, which is attributed to the prophet Habakkuk, and which, according to the present arrangement of the text, forms the conclusion of his prophecy. The reason for this lies mainly in the fact that the very character of the passage—ch. 3 being a poem and not a prophecy—marks it off as something different from what has preceded ; and also in the fact that we have no right to assume *a priori* that the psalm dates from the same period and proceeds from the same hand as chapters 1 and 2.

We have no right to assume it, because not only *Method of Inquiry* has criticism shown that the titles, which are found attached to poetical passages, are no trustworthy criterion as to their date and authorship, but it is a canon of sound historical criticism that every passage or section of a passage should be tested by such means as we have at our disposal, before it may be accepted or rejected. Moreover in the present case, the poem cannot, even on the supposition that it proceeds from the prophet's hand, be said to *determine* the meaning and teaching of his message or the circumstances of his age or the object of his mission; it may elucidate these questions; it may supplement them; but it cannot be said in any reliable way definitely to establish what they are. The message itself, as contained in chs. 1 and 2 if it is in any sense consistent and intelligible, must have sufficiently revealed this. It is the neglect of the above principle of criticism and the tacit assumption that tradition is right that have led many—chiefly earlier—scholars to formulate interpretations which, even if they are possible, are nevertheless strained and improbable. A sound criticism, on the other hand, will require that the psalm should be considered by itself and judged on its own merits; and then only may the further question be discussed as to the relation it bears to the chapters that precede. The method of inquiry will therefore be clear. It will comprise (1) a consideration of the

psalm itself—its contents, the aim of its writer and the circumstances in which he lived ; (2) the question of its relation to chs. 1 and 2 ; and, then, (3) if it be found that the traditional view has to be abandoned, the further question as to its integrity, origin and date, and the probable reason for its insertion in its present position.

(i) *The psalm ; its contents ; the aim and circumstances which it presupposes.*

Contents. The psalm falls into three main divisions : v. 2 ; vv. 3-15 and vv. 16-19. It opens with a prayer. The psalmist has heard of Jehovah's fame, which awakens in him a feeling of awe ; but he prays Jehovah to renew His work in the midst of years, and in wrath to remember compassion (v. 2). The prayer is followed by the description of a theophany. God manifests Himself in the thunder-cloud which the psalmist sees sweeping along from the south, from the mountains of Edom and Paran. It bursts over the land, bringing in its train pestilence and plague. The tribes of the desert tremble in dismay. Nature is stirred at its approach. The rivers and sea are disturbed. The mountains quake. There is no sun, no moon to be seen. Everything betokens the storm of Jehovah's wrath. But it is not at nature that Jehovah is angry ; it is at the nations. In wrath He goes forth to deliver His people. He smites off the head from the godless house, and

treads down the warriors who had come forth as a whirlwind to scatter them (vv. 3-15¹). Here the picture of the theophany ends; and the psalmist again expresses the feeling of awe which comes over him at what he has heard, and concludes—not as in v. ² with a prayer that Jehovah would again manifest His work, but with an expression of confidence in Him. He will rest in the day of trouble, when the people go up to attack; for though the crops fail and the flocks and herds diminish, yet in God will he exult. Jehovah will prove his strength and will cause him to tread upon the high places of the land (vv. 16-19). The text in places is uncertain and corrupt; and the psalm contains passages upon which more than one interpretation have been placed. It is therefore not always possible to say precisely *Situation implied.* what the psalmist intended. The general meaning and drift of the psalm, however, are clear. It is a time of national and material misfortune, and the psalmist speaks in the name of the community (cf. vv. 14, 19); he looks back on the past, and prays that Jehovah will again, as He had done before, intervene on their behalf. He then describes a theophany, which encourages him to rest in this day of trouble; and, in spite of the material misfortune that has befallen them, he and his fellow-countrymen will joyfully trust in Jehovah, who will again lead them to triumph and victory. This would

¹ On v. 15, see *Notes on Heb. Text*, pp. 247 ff.

The Theophany.

appear, in broad outline, to be the situation which the psalm presupposes. But, apart from smaller matters of interpretation, there is one question which it will be necessary to treat of in some detail, as it directly bears on the significance of the psalm. It is the question as to the interpretation of the theophany in vv. 3-15. Are we to suppose that the poet is simply recalling some previous manifestation of Jehovah on His nation's behalf, or is it the case, as some think, that he is really picturing the coming deliverance which he feels Jehovah is about to grant them, though stating it in terms of what Jehovah has done in the past, presumably at the time of the Exodus? In other words, do vv. 3-15 give the answer to the psalmist's prayer? The question is not one which can be easily answered, inasmuch as there are not sufficient data at our disposal which would indicate a definite solution; in fact all that can be done is to point out what would appear to be the more natural conclusion. The latter of the alternative views has been advocated both by earlier as well as by more recent commentators.¹ It has been argued that the theophany described in vv. 3-15 forms really the answer to the prayer in v. 2. The psalmist thinks of the work of deliverance which Jehovah had effected long ago, and prays that He will again manifest Himself on His nation's behalf. In a moment there flashes upon him the vision of

¹ Compare e.g. Kirkpatrick, *Doctrine of Prophets*, pp. 281-290.

Jehovah coming in the storm-cloud to execute judgment on Israel's foes, and he vividly portrays it as though it were an actually realised fact, and under figures, it is said, which are borrowed from the events of the Exodus.¹ In this case the tenses, which are for the most part past, will be understood to refer to the future. In itself this explanation is quite intelligible; a poet may well have pictured Jehovah interposing, on behalf of His people, and have described it as a realised fact. Moreover, v. ¹⁴, which speaks of the foe as 'coming out as a whirlwind to scatter me,' and the further description, 'their rejoicing was as to devour the poor secretly,' would seem to suggest that the writer was portraying a foe with which he himself was familiar. Yet it is not quite clear that this interpretation was the one which the writer intended. The tenses which, as we have said, are for the most part perfects are more naturally understood as descriptive of what has passed; while the expressions just referred to in v. ¹⁴ may denote nothing more than a vividly conceived experience of the past. Moreover, the prayer in v. ² becomes somewhat artificial, if we suppose that the theophany that immediately follows is the answer which the psalmist has received in the spirit to that prayer; in this case we should rather have expected that prayer would have given place to praise, fear to

¹ It is generally thought that Jehovah's work at the time of the Exodus is referred to in the פִּעֲלָךְ of v. ².

joy; and that, instead of supplicating Jehovah to renew His work (v. ²), he would have directly represented Jehovah as coming to judgment and redemption. Again, if the theophany is understood to refer primarily to the future then we are almost certainly compelled ¹ to understand שְׁמַעְתִּי in v. ¹⁶ differently from שְׁמַעְתִּי in v. ²; this is of course possible, but it is more natural to suppose that שְׁמַעְתִּי in v. ¹⁶ takes up again the שְׁמַעְתִּי of v. ² and to think that what the psalmist has heard and prays Jehovah to renew is the theophany which he describes in vv. ³⁻¹⁵. For these reasons, then, it seems better to understand vv. ³⁻¹⁵ as referring to what is past and to form the 'report' which the psalmist has heard. In this case it is possible that he has in mind the great historical event of the Exodus. Ps. 77^{17ff}, which bears a strong resemblance to vv. ³⁻¹⁵ and may be dependent on them, has at any rate been so interpreted (cf. v. ²¹²); and the poetical description of the theophany in the present passage would certainly lend itself to such an

¹ It has been thought that שְׁמַעְתִּי in v. ¹⁶ has no reference to the preceding theophany (so Keil), in which case the objection raised would not apply, but such an interpretation is far from natural. The objection will also not apply in the case of those who think that the ode throughout refers to the future world-judgment and that 'Thy report' and 'Thy work' refer either to the signs of this coming event or else to what the psalmist has seen in vision (cf. Marti, Duhm). But this view rests almost entirely on *a priori* grounds. There is nothing in the psalm which directly suggests such a reference, and, moreover, Jehovah's manifestation is not primarily for judgment but for deliverance (cf. v. ¹³).

² Cf. Briggs, *Psalms*, vol. ii. p. 176—who thinks the verse in question a later addition.

interpretation. Moreover, the thought of Jehovah as coming forth from Teman and Paran not unnaturally recalls the events at Sinai. Still there is nothing in vv. 3-15 which would directly require such a reference. And, though it is true that the memory of the Exodus was always one which was prominent in the mind of the Hebrew poet, yet it does not necessarily follow that that event always coloured a poet's descriptive pictures of deliverance. On the contrary, the primary idea, according to which Jehovah was conceived of as manifesting Himself, seems to have been that of the storm-cloud; and considering the primitiveness of such a conception, it is not unreasonable to think that not a few of the details which we find in these poetic descriptions are traceable to this early idea. It is this which in reality colours the accounts of the Exodus. There would, therefore, necessarily be much in common in these descriptive theophanies, whether of the Exodus or otherwise, and unless we have any explicit reference to the circumstances of the Exodus, we have no right to conclude that the thoughts of a psalmist directly associate themselves with that event. In the present passage, moreover, there are one or two features which would point against such a reference—at least any primary reference. Thus v. 12 speaks of the peoples *in the plural* which would be somewhat unexpected in a passage which is supposed to refer primarily to the people of Egypt; while in v. 13 the

phrase, 'Thy anointed,' would seem to indicate the time of the monarchy unless indeed we are to understand by it, as some scholars hold, the nation Israel; this latter usage, however, though possible, is by no means certain and *has still to be proved*. These indications, slight as they are, taken in connection with the fact that there is no direct reference to Egypt, suggest at any rate that the passage is capable of a different explanation from that which has been usually advanced. And, as a matter of fact, may we not suppose that the ode commemorates either generally Israel's victories over its enemies or, if it be thought that vv. ^{13, 14} indicate a particular foe in question, some special occasion of victory? There is more than one occasion in the nation's history which might suggest itself as a special instance of Jehovah's intervention. Here, however, the question must be left but we shall have occasion to refer to it later, when we come to estimate finally the nature and character of the psalm. For the present all that need be said is that the view which would regard vv. ³⁻¹⁵ as essentially referring to the past would seem to be the more natural one.¹

There is one further point, which we should perhaps notice before we pass on to consider the nature and

¹ Vv. ³⁻¹⁵ will, then, form the report which the psalmist has heard, the 'work' which he would fain see repeated 'in the midst of years.' In this case we might have expected that in vv. ^{3ff} the psalmist would have directly addressed Jehovah, viz. 'Thou Jehovah didst come,' etc.; but the interpretation does not necessarily require it; vv. ^{3ff} may be directly attached in thought to שמעך.

circumstances of the psalm ; it relates to the difficult clause in v. ¹⁶, which is usually rendered : ‘that I should rest in the day of trouble when it cometh up against the people which invadeth us (so emend) in troops.’ A fuller discussion will be given in the notes on the Hebrew text as to the proposed renderings of these very difficult words. All that we intend to refer to now is the interpretation which has been placed on the words, ‘the day of trouble.’ It is not uncommonly thought that ‘the day of trouble’ refers primarily to the theophany which has been described in vv. ³⁻¹⁵, ‘the day of trouble’ being more exactly either the world-judgment in which Jehovah will execute judgment on the nations, or else the day which is to witness Jehovah’s judgment on Israel’s (present) foes ; and it is said that ‘this manifestation of the great God [would be] terrible even to Israel, notwithstanding that the issue of it [would] be the deliverance of the people of God, and the destruction of their adversaries.’¹ But, on either interpretation, such an explanation is very doubtful. The language of vv. ³⁻¹⁵ does not lend itself readily to a representation of the judgment which Jehovah is thought of as executing on the nations at the time of the Messianic age ; the picture is quite different to such eschatological pictures as we find in later literature ; nor is it at all natural to speak of the day, which was to bring Israel deliverance, directly as ‘a day of trouble.’

¹ Comp. Dav. *Camb. Bib.* p. 93.

Zeph. 1¹⁵ has been adduced in support; but the two passages are really distinct. There Jehovah's manifestation is spoken of naturally as a day of wrath and as a day of trouble, because it will bring judgment *on Judah and not on its foes* (cf. Zeph. 1⁴). Here throughout the theophany there is not the slightest hint of any coming judgment on Israel, while the purpose of Jehovah's manifestation is solely for its deliverance. In fact the present passage finds a close parallel in Ps. 18 (= 2 Sam. 22), where Israel's victories over its enemies are pictured in the terms of a theophany. The text in v. 16^b is no doubt corrupt, and, though it is uncertain how it should be emended, there is some reason (cf. *Notes on Heb. Text*, pp. 251 ff.) for believing that what is referred to is not the theophany which has been described, but the time of trouble and wrath, to which the psalmist alludes in v. 2, and which makes him long for Jehovah's intervention.

We are now in a position to summarise the inferences, which may be drawn from the psalm itself, as to its nature and circumstances. And we may infer (1) that the psalm is national; the psalmist speaks in the name of the nation or community (cf. vv. 14, 19). (2) That the psalmist is writing at a time which would seem to indicate Jehovah's displeasure at His people, for they are being invaded by a foe, or at least threatened with an invasion, while the country is apparently suffering from some natural calamity (cf. vv. 2, 16-17). (3) That he has heard of

*Nature and
circumstances
of the Psalm.*

Jehovah's fame and work in the time past, and prays that He would again show mercy and manifest Himself (cf. v. ²). (4) That the theophany which is described is most probably the report which he has heard and the work which he asks Jehovah to renew. And (5) it will follow from this that the theophany pictures, not a universal world-wide judgment, but Jehovah's intervention for the deliverance of His people from their foe. (6) That the description of the foe whose conquest the theophany celebrates, is too general for one to say what foe is intended, but the reference to 'Thy anointed' would seem to indicate the period of the monarchy when some Davidic monarch was reigning. (7) That as the theophany relates in all probability to what is past, its details cannot be regarded as throwing light on the circumstances of the time in which the psalmist wrote, except perhaps in case of v. ¹⁴, which may possibly reflect the character of the nation's present foe. (8) That the description of the theophany was probably intended to serve a twofold purpose: (a) to recall before Jehovah what He had done in the past on Israel's behalf, and (b) to encourage and keep alive within the nation the spirit of hope and trust in Jehovah. Such are the inferences which we may draw from the psalm itself as to its character and the conditions under which it would seem to have been written; and though they may not be so specific as one might desire, yet they will be seen to be helpful

in enabling us to come to some conclusion as to the relation of the psalm to chs. 1 and 2, which is the next question to be considered.

(ii) *The relation of chapter 3 to chapters 1 and 2.*

Does ch. 3 connect with chs. 1 and 2?

It has already been remarked that earlier views have tacitly assumed the accuracy of tradition, and have endeavoured to substantiate the connection of ch. 3 with chs. 1 and 2. Thus it has been urged that שמעך 'thy report' in 3² is used in the sense of 'message' or 'oracle' and refers to the vision which the prophet has received in 2⁴. But this is a more than doubtful procedure, for שמע has nowhere else in the Old Testament this meaning and the genitive which follows שמע (when used in the passive sense) is always that of the object and not subject; moreover, as the oracle in 2⁴ has been described as a 'vision' (חזון), we should naturally have expected the prophet to have used the same term here.¹ Or it has been argued, again, that the motive of the prayer in 3² is to *hasten* either the deliverance implied by the oracle in 2⁴, which might, it was feared, be long delayed,² or else the universal rule of the messianic age, pictured it is said in 2¹⁴, and which is to be preceded by the manifestation of Jehovah in judgment.³ But 2³ lends no support to the thought that deliverance would be

¹ The parallel פעלך would also strongly militate against the view that שמע is used in other than its ordinary sense.

² Comp. Kirkpatrick, *Doctrine of the Prophets*, p. 281.

³ Comp. Orelli, *Twelve Minor Prophets*, p. 252.

long delayed ; on the contrary it is implied that such a deliverance would soon be effected and its delay is only mentioned as a possibility. Nor can it be said that chs. 1 and 2 give any indication of a future judgment which is to befall either Israel or the nations. On the contrary the advent of the Chaldean is already the Divine judgment, and what 2^{4b} refers to is the principle by which that judgment—and not some later judgment—is to be sustained : while ‘the knowledge of Jehovah’s glory’ in 2¹⁴ (if genuine) simply refers to the glory manifested in the overthrow of the Chaldean. It will accordingly be seen from these attempted explanations that ch. 3 can have no very close literary connection with chs. 1 and 2 ; and recent writers, who hold the possibility that all three chapters have been written by the same author, for the most part refrain from connecting the psalm *directly* with what has preceded, and only suggest that it may have been composed under circumstances similar to those of chs. 1 and 2. Now there are one or two *Points of resemblance.* features in ch. 3 which might be regarded as implying a situation similar to that of chs. 1 and 2. For instance the psalm was evidently written at a time of national trouble, when the nation was at least threatened with an invasion (cf. vv. 2, 16) ; this would agree quite well with the circumstances of chs. 1 and 2, where, as we have seen, the Chaldeans were assuming a threatening attitude towards Judah ; and we might, accordingly, identify the foe alluded to in 3¹⁶

with that people. Again, the theophany might conceivably be regarded as descriptive of Jehovah's coming judgment on the Chaldean (though this would imply a different view of vv. ³⁻¹⁵ from that which has been advocated above), in which case the terms of the theophany (cf. esp. vv. ^{13, 14}) might be understood to refer primarily to that power and the allusion to 'Thy anointed' in v. ¹³ be regarded as referring to the reigning Jewish monarch, or else they might be understood more generally and as only indirectly descriptive of the Chaldean and of the judgment which Jehovah is about to execute upon them. But these features at the most only show that the psalm might possibly *lend itself* to such a situation as chs. 1 and 2 imply, and they do not indicate in any direct and explicit way that this

*Points of
difference.*

was the actual situation implied. There are, however, several considerations which would tend to create the impression that the origin of the psalm is really distinct from that of chs. 1 and 2. (1) The situation would appear to be different. Though in both passages the nation seems to be threatened by invasion, yet other features in the situation are different. In chs. 1 and 2 the prophet's thoughts centre mainly, as we have seen, on the outrage which is being committed against the peoples; in ch. 3 not only is there no reference made to this, but the peoples are pictured in the theophany as those whom Jehovah treads down in His wrath (cf. v. ¹²)—just

the reverse of what the prophet desired to see. Again, in ch. 3 the country is apparently suffering from some natural calamity, whereas in chs. 1 and 2 no reference is made to this, and *vice versa* no reference is made in ch. 3 to the political discord and confusion and to the fate of the 'Torah,' to which we find allusion in 1⁴. Moreover, 3² creates the impression that the nation had for some considerable time been subject to Divine wrath (cf. the phrases 'in the midst of years'¹ and 'in wrath remember mercy') from which the psalmist in the name of the community prays that they may be soon delivered. This would hardly agree with the circumstances of chs. 1 and 2, according to which the nation had not as yet apparently experienced the hostility of the Chaldean, nor could it be said at that time to have been witnessing trouble for any considerable length of time. (2) If, as we are disposed to think, vv. 3-15 allude to what is past, then it must be admitted that the remembrance of Jehovah's past acts of mercy to His people betrays rather the absence of prophetic revelation; but this would hardly be expected in view of Jehovah's answer in 2⁴. (3) The aim of these chapters is different. In chs. 1 and 2 the prophet's main purpose is to call attention to the violence of the Chaldean, and to predict the judgment that is about to befall them; whereas in ch. 3 the purpose of the writer is apparently to keep alive within the

¹ Comp. *Notes on Heb. Text*, pp. 218 ff.

community the spirit of hope and trust in Jehovah, during a period of trouble, either by inspiring them with the prospect of what Jehovah is about to do on their behalf, or more probably, as we have seen, simply by recalling what He has done in the past. And, lastly, (4) in chs. 1 and 2 the prophet is the speaker ; whereas in ch. 3 the speaker is the nation. These differences are on the whole considerable, and, though it is possible no doubt in some measure to harmonize them, yet when viewed impartially they do tend to

Conclusion. show that the psalm stood originally in no close connection with the chapters that precede, and, accordingly, make it improbable that Habakkuk is its author.

The fact that also musical directions and notes have been added to the psalm must not be overlooked. This has no analogy in the writings of the prophets, and is certainly not what we should expect ; nor do we find such additions in the poetical passages which occur in the historical books. It rather confirms the impression, already received, that the psalm was no original part of the book, and has in fact a different origin.

(iii) *The origin, present position, integrity and probable date of the psalm.*

Psalm probably taken from Jewish Song-book,

The analogy of the psalms would lead us to infer that the 'Prayer of Habakkuk' originally belonged to a song-book of the Jewish community ; the musical notes and directions, which we find, are intended for its right performance in public worship, and in reality can only have

been added to serve that purpose. We may, accordingly, conclude with much probability that it has been excepted from one of the temple collections of psalms, and transferred to its present position, partly, no doubt, because it had been attributed to the prophet in the original collection, and also partly because a later editor wished to provide a somewhat more suitable conclusion for the book.

The date and occasion of the psalm are more difficult to decide; and it will be necessary first to consider the question as to whether the psalm may really not be composite. The phenomenon of *and probably composite.* composite psalms is not new, and recent criticism would tend to show that it also is not rare. In the present case it has been urged that vv. ¹⁷⁻¹⁹ are not the genuine close of the psalm on the ground (1) that the causal clause connects very loosely with the preceding v. ¹⁶. It is difficult, it is said, to see how the failure of crops can give a reason for the prophet's alarm at the manifestation of Jehovah in judgment on His people's foes. And because (2) 'the verse does not suggest a condition of scarcity and barrenness arising from a hostile invasion of the land but rather one due to the incidence of severe natural calamities' (Davidson). In view of the interpretation (cp. above) usually placed on v. ^{16b}, these arguments would certainly be weighty, but there are good reasons for discrediting this interpretation (cp. above, and also *Notes on*

the Hebrew Text, pp. 251 ff.), and for believing that v. ^{16b} expresses not the psalmist's alarm at Jehovah's manifestation, but his confidence and trust, his firm resolve to rest upon Jehovah in the day of trouble; in this case v. ^{16b} will be closely associated with vv. ^{18, 19} which are an expression of joyful confidence in Jehovah. Accordingly it may quite well be supposed that the psalmist, instead of simply writing 'I will rest in the day of trouble . . . for I will exult in Jehovah,' etc., breaks off and inserts after 'for' a reference to the present failure of crops due either to the effects of invasion or, perhaps more probably, to natural calamities in order to emphasise still more, by way of contrast, his present joyful confidence in Jehovah. If this view of v. ^{16b}, and its connection with the remaining verses, be correct, then there would appear to be no good reason for doubting their genuineness; moreover v. ¹⁶ would not give a very suitable conclusion to the psalm, and it would be difficult therefore to think that the psalm originally ended there.¹ But, though it would seem we have no sufficient reason for doubting the genuineness of vv. ¹⁷⁻¹⁹, it is a little doubtful whether we are right in regarding the present psalm as one original composition. It does not appear improbable that vv. ³⁻¹⁵ may have been originally an earlier ode or part

¹ Some scholars, however, think that vv. ¹⁷⁻¹⁹ are simply replacing the original conclusion (cf. We. Dr.); others, again, think that v. ¹⁷ only is an insertion (cf. Bu. GAS.); but neither of these views would appear to be necessary in view of what has been said above.

of an earlier ode to which a later editor has added v. ² as an introduction and vv. ¹⁶⁻¹⁹ as a conclusion in order to make it more applicable to the circumstances of his time and for use in public worship. There are one or two reasons which would go to indicate this. (1) The form in which the present psalm is constructed. The two שְׁמַעְתִּי in v. ² and v. ¹⁶ appear to mark off vv. ³⁻¹⁵ as something distinct and give the impression that they are the framework in which these verses have been set. (2) v. ³ follows somewhat abruptly after v. ². It is quite possible, as we have already remarked, that the poet may be graphically repeating the report as it reached him, but this abruptness would receive a still more natural explanation if vv. ³⁻¹⁵ were actually a quotation of some earlier ode. And (3) while in point of language there is nothing which would emphatically dissociate vv. ^{2, 16-19} from the rest of the psalm,¹ yet v. ¹⁹ is clearly dependent on Ps. 18^{33, 34} and v. ¹⁸ reminds one of many passages in the psalms (cf. Ps. 9¹⁵, 13⁶, 75¹⁰). This would seem to betray less originality, and be just what we should expect if these verses are really a later addition. These reasons, it must be admitted, are not conclusive; yet, on the whole, they would *seem to suggest* the view that vv. ³⁻¹⁵ have

¹ Compare, however, פָּעַל, which in the sense of 'deliverance,' 'redemption' represents a later usage, cf. Ps. 44² 77¹³; רָצוּן (exilic and post-exilic); the use of הַיָּדָע (if *Nif'al* is to be read in v. ²) with reference to Jehovah is also not earlier than exile.

been taken up by a later writer, who has added introductory and concluding verses in order to make the passage more applicable to the conditions and use of his own age. Moreover, the way in which the poet dwells on the past ('I have heard Thy report') not only suggests that he would go on to mention what that past is, cf. Pss. 44, 77, etc., but favours also the supposition that he may actually be quoting here some older poem.¹ In this case vv. 3-15 may quite well be a pre-exilic composition. There is nothing in them which would definitely suggest a late date; and it is an exaggeration to say that the linguistic features are such as to exclude the pre-exilic period.² There are, moreover, one or two features which would strongly indicate their pre-exilic origin. Thus the representation of Jehovah as coming forth from the south is an early one; in exilic and post-exilic times it is Jerusalem or the heavens which are regarded as Jehovah's abode³; this would indicate that at the time of their

*The question
of date.*

¹ V. 14b, which not unlikely reflects the character of the present foe, may however have been substituted by the editor for the original in order to make the description of the theophany more suggestive in view of the conditions of his own time.

² The only words which might possibly suggest a late date are תִּימֹן, קְרוֹשׁ, but these are certainly not decisive; תִּימֹן besides Ob. 9 Ez. 25¹³, Gen. 36 (P), occurs in Jer. 49^{7,20} and also Am. 1¹² (but this passage is doubtful); קְרוֹשׁ, thus absolutely, is found in Is.² and Job, but in *poetry* it might well be used from the time of Isaiah, cf. Hab. 1¹² and the intensive plural in Hos. 12¹. While the use of אֱלֹהֵי in pre-exilic literature—which has been quoted as a mark of late date (cf. *Encyc. Bib.* col. 1928)—is vouched for by Dt 33^{13, 17}. On זְבֻלָּה cf. *Notes on Hebrew Text*, p. 242.

³ Comp. Dav. *Camb. Bib.* p. 84.

composition the association of Jehovah with the Temple at Jerusalem had not yet so familiarised itself in the mind of the nation as to *exclude* the earlier and traditional view. The other feature is the use of מִשִּׁיחַ; this would naturally indicate the time of the monarchy. It is true that it has been explained to mean 'the nation Israel,' but this usage, as we have said, has still to be proved: and, moreover, in the present case, such a usage would be tautologous. For these reasons, then, we are inclined to place their composition in the time of the monarchy—perhaps the later monarchy, and the ode (vv. 3-15) may commemorate generally the nation's victories or perhaps more probably some particular victory which was conceived of as due to the special intervention of Jehovah on the nation's behalf. It is more difficult to fix the date when the psalm received its present form. The remembrance of the past in order to give encouragement for the present suggests an exilic or post-exilic date. It is a time of trouble, moreover, when the community is at least being threatened by the ravages of some hostile people, and when, perhaps, some natural calamity had befallen the land. We might think of the Jewish community in the early post-exilic times when it was liable to the attacks of the neighbouring peoples (cf. יִגְדּוּ לָעַם 'the people that invadeth in troops'—which might possibly suggest this); but it may be still later. In fact, with the data at hand, it is impossible to affirm definitely when the psalm received its present form.

TRANSLATION

WITH

BRIEF ANNOTATIONS

N.B.—The sign < > denotes that the word or words enclosed represent either an entire or partial emendation of the Massoretic Text.

§ 1. THE SUPERScription. I, 1.

1. The divine sentence which Habakkuk the prophet saw.

§ 2. THE PROPHET'S EXPOSTULATION. I, 2-17.

The near approach of the Chaldean is causing discord within Judah, with the result that the Torah¹ is being set aside. I, 2-4.

2. How long, Jehovah, do I call for help,
And Thou hearest not?
I cry out unto Thee, Violence!
And Thou dost not save.
3. Wherefore dost Thou cause me to see trouble
and mischief,
Do <I>² look on <spoliation>³ and violence?
Before me <(are) strife and contention>.⁴
4. Therefore Torah is numbed,
And right will never go forth;
For <wickedness>⁵ surrounds the righteous,
Therefore right goeth forth crooked.

¹ For an explanation of the term, cf. pp. 22 ff. ² M.T. = 2nd pers. sing. ³ M.T. 'and spoliation.' ⁴ M.T. as in R.V. 'And there is strife, and contention riseth up.' The above rendering of this verse rests on a different grouping of the words from that of M.T. (cf. R.V.). ⁵ M.T. 'wicked,' pointing the consonants differently.

*The surprise which the Chaldean is causing
among the peoples.* 1, 5.

5. <The>¹ peoples <have seen and beheld>,²
<They tarry and are astonished>³;
For a work <is being done>⁴ in <their>⁵ days—
<They>⁶ would not believe were it told (them).⁷

A description of the Chaldean. 1, 6-11.

6. For <lo !>⁸ the Chaldeans,
That fierce and hasty nation,
That march on through the breadths of the land,
In order to possess dwelling-places not their
own—
7. Terrible and fearful are they ;
From themselves <proceed>⁹ their right and
dignity.
8. <Swifter>¹⁰ than leopards are their horses,
And keener than evening wolves.
<And their horsemen hasten from afar>¹¹ ;
They fly like the vulture, hastening to devour.
9. All of them come for violence ;
<Yea, they turn (themselves) everywhere>¹²
And gather together captives like sand.

¹ M.T. 'among the.' ² M.T. 'see ye and behold,' pointing differently. ³ M.T. 'and astonish yourselves, be astonished.'

⁴ M.T. 'one doth' (cf. R.Vm.). ⁵ M.T. 'your.' ⁶ M.T. 'you.'

⁷ On the whole verse, comp. pp. 30 ff. ⁸ M.T. 'lo ! I am raising up.'

⁹ M.T. *sing.* 'proceeds.' ¹⁰ M.T. 'and swifter.' ¹¹ M.T. 'and their horsemen spring about (not as EVV. 'spread themselves') and their horsemen come from afar.'

¹² M.T. very uncertain ; R.Vm. 'the eagerness (or assembling) of their faces is towards the east.'

10. And they scoff at kings,
And potentates are sport to them ;
They laugh at every fortress,
And heap up earth and capture it.
11. Then they sweep on <as>¹ wind,
And they pass by and <lay waste>² ;
This (people)—their strength becomes their god.

The prophet's confidence in Jehovah. 1, 12.

12. Art Thou not of old, O Jehovah ?
My God, my Holy One, we shall not die.
Jehovah, for judgment Thou hast set them ;
And, Rock, to correct Thou hast established
them.

The prophet's difficulty. 1, 13-16.

13. Too pure in eyes to see evil,
And to look at mischief Thou canst not—
Wherefore dost Thou look at treacherous men,
Art silent when the wicked swallow up those
more in the right than they ?
14. And Thou makest men like the fishes of the sea,
Like the creeping things that have no ruler ;
15. All of them they bring up with the hook,
They drag them in with their net,
And they gather them together with their drag-
net ;
Therefore they rejoice and exult.

¹ M.T. without 'as.'

² M.T. 'become guilty.'

16. Therefore they sacrifice to their net,
And burn incense to their drag-net;
For by them their portion is rich,
And their food fat.

The prophet's question. 1, 17.

17. Will they <for ever> ¹ draw ² their <sword>, ³
And continually <slay> ⁴ nations unsparingly?

§ 3. JEHOVAH'S ANSWER. 2, 1-5.

The prophet awaits His answer. 2, 1.

1. Upon my outlook will I stand,
And station myself on the rampart;
And I will watch to see what He will speak with
me, ⁵
And what answer <He> ⁶ will return to my plea.

The answer. 2, 1-4.

2. And Jehovah answered me and said:
Write a vision and make (it) distinct upon tablets,
In order that he who reads it may run. ⁷
3. For yet is the vision for the appointed time;
And it panteth for the end and will not fail;
If it tarry, wait thou for it;
For it will surely come, it will not delay.

¹ M.T. 'therefore.'

² *Lit.* 'empty out' (cf. Ex. 15⁹).

³ M.T. 'net.'

⁴ M.T. 'to slay.'

⁵ *Lit.* 'in me.'

⁶ M.T. 'I.'

⁷ *i.e.* that one may read it readily.

4. 'Behold <swollen is their¹ soul>² within them,'
And 'The righteous by their faithfulness shall
live.'

The prophet's comment. 2, 5.

5. <They . . . and are not satiated>,³
And they are like Death and are not satisfied ;
They gather to themselves all nations,
And collect to themselves all peoples.

§ 4. A TAUNT-SONG. 2, 6-17.

The first part. The Chaldean's lust for conquest.
2, 6-8.

6. Shall not these,⁴ all of them, take up against
them a taunt-song,
And a satire . . . ?⁵ <Saying>,⁶
'Ah! he that multiplies what is not his own—
how long?—
And ladeth himself with pledges ;

¹ *i.e.* the Chaldeans. ² M.T. 'swollen is (and) not even is their soul.' ³ M.T. 'and furthermore wine is a treacherous dealer, a haughty man and does not abide (?)'—the text is clearly corrupt; the following words, 'who enlargeth his desire as Sheol,' are probably to be omitted as a gloss; comp. *Notes on the Heb. Text*, p. 196.

⁴ *i.e.* the peoples. ⁵ Text uncertain; M.T. '(even) pointed sayings with reference to them.' ⁶ M.T. 'and (each one) will say.'

7. Shall not thy biters¹ on a sudden rise up,
 And thy shakers awake,
 And thou shalt be for plunder to them?
8. Because thou hast spoiled many nations
 The whole remnant of peoples shall spoil thee,
 On account of the murder of men and the out-
 rage to earth,
 To city, and all the inhabitants therein.'

The second part. Their selfishness and oppression.

2, 9-11.

9. 'Ah! he that gains evil gain for his house,
 To set on high his nest,
 To be delivered from the hand of misfortune.
10. Thou hast counselled shame for thy house,
 <Thou hast cut off>² many nations,
 And <forfeited>³ thy soul.
11. For a stone from the wall shall cry out,
 And a rafter from the woodwork shall answer
 it.'

The third part.⁴ Their unscrupulousness.

2, 12-14.

12. 'Ah! he that builds a town by bloodshed,
 And establishes a city in iniquity,

¹ Or 'thy debtors'; there is a play on the double sense of the word *nashak*. *Comp. Notes on Heb. Text*, p. 200. ² M.T. 'in cutting off'—the emendation rests solely on a different pronunciation of the Heb. word. ³ M.T. 'forfeiting,' pronouncing the Heb. word differently.

⁴ The authenticity of this section is doubtful; cf. pp. 38 f.

13. Are <they>¹ not from Jehovah of Hosts—
That "nations labour for fire
And peoples weary themselves for naught";²
14. For "the earth shall be filled with the know-
ledge of the glory of Jehovah
Like the waters that cover the sea"?³

*The fourth part. Their contemptuous treatment
of the vanquished. 2, 15-17.*

15. 'Ah! he that giveth his neighbours to drink
<from the goblet of his fury>,⁴
And also maketh drunk,
In order to look upon their nakedness.
16. Thou art filled with shame rather than glory;
Drink also thou and <stagger>.⁵
The cup of Jehovah's right hand shall come
round unto thee,
And <disgrace shall . . .>⁶ upon thy glory;
17. For the outrage to Lebanon shall cover thee,
And the destruction of the beasts shall dismay
<thee>⁷:
On account of the murder of men and the out-
rage to earth,
To city and all the inhabitants therein.'

¹ M.T. 'behold'—the emendation 'they' will be understood to refer to the two following quotations.

² Comp. Jer. 51⁵⁸.

³ Comp. Is. 11⁹.

⁴ M.T. 'pourest thy fury' (R.Vm.).

⁵ M.T. 'be regarded as uncircumcised.'

⁶ M.T. 'disgrace'—the Heb. word occurs only here, and is suspicious; the emendation implies the usual word for 'disgrace.' Comp. *Notes on Heb. Text*, pp. 210 f.

⁷ M.T. 'them' (in which case we must render as R.V.).

§ 5. WOE TO THE IDOLATER! 2, 19, 18.¹

19. Ah! he that says to the wood, Awake!
 Arouse thyself! to a dumb stone,
 Shall it teach?—Behold it is encased in gold
 and silver;
 And there is no breath at all within it.
18. What profits a graven image that its fashioner
 has graven it,
 A molten image and a teacher of falsehood,
 That <its fashioner>² has trusted upon it,
 To make dumb idols?

§ 6. A TRANSITIONAL VERSE.³ 2, 20.

20. And Jehovah is in His holy Temple;
 Be silent before Him, all the earth!

§ 7. A PSALM.⁴ 3.*The Title.* 3, 1.

1. The prayer of Habakkuk the prophet. With ⁵
 tune-changes.⁶

¹ On these verses, comp. p. 39; they are probably not genuine.
² M.T. 'the fashioner of its form.' ³ An editorial addition; cf.
 pp. 39 f. ⁴ On the genuineness of this psalm, cf. pp. 120 ff. ⁵ *Lit.*
 'according to.' ⁶ The meaning of the Heb. word is doubtful; for
 the above rendering, comp. *Notes on Heb. Text*, pp. 216 f.

A prayer that Jehovah would again manifest His power, as He had done in the past, on His people's behalf. 3, 2.

2. Jehovah, I¹ have heard Thy report ;
 <I have seen>,² Jehovah, Thy work.³
 In the midst of years <make Thyself known>,⁴
 In wrath remember mercy.

A Theophany. God is represented as appearing in the storm-cloud in order to rescue His people and anointed one. The theophany probably refers to the past, and is the report which the psalmist has heard. 3, 3-15.

3. God from Teman came,
 And the Holy One from mount Paran ;
 His grandeur covered the heavens,
 And the land was filled with His praise.
4. Rays of light were at His side⁵
 And there⁶ was the hiding-place of His power.

¹ The community is the speaker. ² M.T. 'I was afraid.'

³ M.T. adds 'in the midst of years revive it'; with this addition ^{2a} would read: 'Jehovah, I have heard Thy report, I was afraid (retaining M.T.); Jehovah, Thy work—in the midst of years revive it.'

⁴ M.T. 'make known.' ⁵ M.T. reads: 'And there was brightness like the sun-light, rays of light were at His side'—but the first clause is probably to be omitted as a gloss, comp. *Notes on Heb. Text*, pp. 225 ff.).

⁶ *i.e.* where the rays of light shoot forth. The psalmist is picturing the rays of sunlight shooting out from behind the dark storm-cloud.

5. Pestilence went before Him,
And fiery darts shot forth at His feet.
6. He stood and <made>¹ the earth <to melt>,¹
He looked and made the peoples start;
And the eternal mountains were shattered,
The everlasting hills sank down.²
7. Under trouble I saw (?)³ the tents of Cushan,
The curtains of the land of Midian trembled.
8. <Wast Thou angry, Jehovah, at the rivers> ⁴?
Or against the sea was Thy wrath?
That Thou didst ride upon Thy horses,
. . .⁵ Thy chariots in triumph.
9. <Thou didst lay bare>⁶ Thy bow,
<The hills tottered> ⁷;
<Thou didst light up the highway>,⁸
Into rivers <was>⁹ the land <rent>.⁹
10. The mountains saw Thee, they writhed;
<The clouds poured down>¹⁰ water,
The deep lifted its voice,
<The seas raised their>¹¹ hands.

¹ M.T. 'measured.' ² M.T. adds 'His were goings of old'; probably a marginal gloss, comp. *Notes on Heb. Text*, pp. 231 f.

³ Comp. *Notes on Heb. Text*, p. 232. ⁴ M.T. 'was Jehovah

angry at the rivers? Or was Thy anger against the rivers?' ⁵ Some verb seems desiderated, answering to 'Thou didst ride.'

⁶ M.T. 'was laid bare' ('Thy bow' being subject; cf. R.V.). ⁷ M.T.

'oaths tribes'—quite unintelligible. ⁸ M.T. 'a word. Selah'—quite unintelligible and corrupt.

⁹ M.T. 'Thou didst rend' (taking 'land' as object). ¹⁰ M.T. 'passed on the downpour of.'

¹¹ M.T. 'on high it (*i.e.* the deep) lifted up (not the same as the word rendered "raised" above; the word "lifted up" is conjectured to

11. The sun withdrew,¹
 The moon stood still in <her>² dwelling,
 At the light of Thy shafts as they sped,
 At the brightness of Thy glittering spear.
12. In indignation Thou didst tread the land,
 In anger Thou didst thresh the peoples.
13. Thou wentest forth to the salvation of Thy
 people,
 <To save>³ Thine anointed;
 Thou didst smite the head from off the house
 of the wicked,
 <Thou didst lay bare>⁴ the foundation unto the
 neck.
14. Thou didst pierce with <Thy>⁵ spears the head
 of his warriors;
 They came as a whirlwind to scatter me,
 Their exultation was as it were (?) to devour the
 poor secretly.⁶
15. Thou didst tread <upon them>⁷ with Thy
 horses,
 <Like>⁸ the surging of many waters.

belong to following verse; comp. *Notes on Heb. Text*, pp. 239 ff.)
 its.'

¹ Answering to the word rendered in R.V. 'lifted up' (v. 10).

² M.T. does not express the pronoun. ³ M.T. 'for salvation'—
 implying an inadmissible construction, comp. *Notes on Heb. Text*, p. 243.

⁴ M.T. 'laying bare.' ⁵ M.T. 'his.' ⁶ The text of this line
 is open to suspicion. ⁷ M.T. 'on the sea.' ⁸ M.T. omits.

And upon my high places will He cause me to tread.

*A subscription.*¹ 3, 19^b.

19^b. For the director; on my (?)² stringed instruments.

¹ Probably not an original part of the psalm, comp. *Notes on Heb. Text*, p. 257.

² Comp. *id.* p. 256.

NOTES
ON
THE HEBREW TEXT

[המשא] As a title to a prophecy the word occurs again in Is. 13¹ 'משא בבל אשר חזה יטעיהו בן-א' 14²⁸, 15¹ 'משא מואב, 17¹, 19¹, 21^{1, 11, 13}, 22¹, 23¹, 30⁶; Nah. 1¹ 'משא ניוה; Zc. 9¹ 'משא דבר יהוה; Mal. 1¹; and as a prophetic term, Jer. 23^{33, 34, 36, 38}; Ez. 12¹⁰. It is found also in historical literature, 2 K. 9²⁵ ויהוה נשא עליהם את-המשא הזה; 2 Chr. 24²⁷ ויחזו לך משאות וג' (Kt.); and its plural or that of a cognate word occurs once in poetry, Lam. 2¹⁴ ויחזו לך משאות וג'. In Pr. 30¹ the text is most probably corrupt (cf. Toy, *Inter. Comm.*). It will be seen that, though the expression occurs in the different species of Hebrew literature (except perhaps Wisdom Lit.), its use is for the most part confined to the titles of prophecies. It is not found in the earlier prophets, and its earliest occurrence in Hebrew literature is apparently 2 K. 9²⁵; but as a prophetic expression the word would appear to have been of frequent use in the time of Jeremiah (cf. 23³³, etc.). The exact meaning of the term is not quite certain. It is usually connected with the use of נשא in such phrases as נשא קול (cf. Gen. 21¹⁶; Is. 52⁸) or נשא משל etc., and explained to mean 'that

which is lifted up,' namely, by a prophet, and so 'solemn utterance or oracle.' But this explanation is not free from difficulty. For (a) מִשָּׁה in itself simply means 'to raise, lift up,' and it is only when it is defined by an object such as מִשָּׁל, קוֹל, שֵׁם, קִינָה, etc., or by the prepositional phrase עַל-פִּי וְג' (cf. Ps. 50¹⁶) or עַל-שִׁפְתָי (cf. Ps. 16⁴) that its meaning approximates to that of 'utter.' Consequently we should not expect מִשָּׁה to be used in the sense of 'utterance,' except in conjunction with some word (or words) which would indicate more precisely this meaning. And (b) the meaning 'utterance' would not appear to suit all the passages in which the word occurs. Thus in the phrase מִשָּׁה דְּבַר יְהוָה (Zc. 9¹, 12¹), דְּבַר would be somewhat otiose, if מִשָּׁה is used with this significance; while in 2 Chr. 24²⁷ (*si ver. lect.*) it would be difficult to see exactly the force of רַב. Moreover (c) if מִשָּׁה has this meaning, it would be natural to suppose that its occurrence would be more frequent, and its use less restricted. In view of these difficulties it is reasonable to ask whether after all this is the correct explanation of the expression, and whether we should not rather look in some other direction for its meaning. If we examine the passages in which the word occurs, we shall find that it is mostly used in connection with passages which speak of impending or threatened judgment, *e.g.* in the prophetic superscriptions,¹

¹ Nowack (*Kl. Proph.* p. 250) is scarcely right in excepting Zc. 9¹, 12¹.

and 2 K. 9²⁵, where the reference is to the doom pronounced on Ahab's house. This creates the presumption that the meaning of מִשָּׁה will directly bear upon the nature of the pronouncement. In other words, we may conjecture that the word conveyed some such meaning as 'sentence' (judicial), 'condemnation.' If this is the case, it seems best to explain it as a metaphorical use of מִשָּׁה 'burden,' 'load,' and the full phrase will then be similar to that which is found in 2 K. 9²⁵ וַיְהִי וַיִּשָּׂא עָלָיו אֶת-הַמָּוֶה הַזֶּה lit. 'And Jehovah lifted up this load upon him,' i.e. inflicted or pronounced this sentence upon him, the sentence being viewed figuratively as a load resting upon the person sentenced. This explanation would meet the requirements of the passages in which the word occurs. In the superscriptions (where its presence is no doubt due to the editor or editors) it is a noticeable fact that, with the exception of the superscription in Malachi (where the reference is to Judah), it is only found in connection with those prophecies which speak of *threatened judgment on a foreign nation or nations*, viz. in the prophecies on foreign nations in Isaiah; in Nahum, which describes the coming judgment on Nineveh; in Zc. 9¹ and 12¹, where in the former passage the prophet announces the judgment about to fall on the chief Syrian and Philistine cities, and where in the latter an overthrow of nations assembled against Jerusalem is described; and in the present prophecy, which predicts punish-

ment on the Chaldean. If מִשַּׁא meant simply 'oracle,' the reason for this restriction in usage would not be clear; on the other hand, if the word has the meaning of 'sentence,' etc., it is not difficult to see why an editor should have all but confined its use to cases where the reference is to judgment on Judah's foes. Moreover, in 2 Chr. 24²⁷ the expression רַב הַמִּשַּׁא becomes at once natural, if it is understood to mean 'the severity of his sentence,' lit. 'the abundance of the load upon him'; while in the passage in Jer. 23^{33f} (cf. Lam. 2¹⁴) the reference will be not so much to the abuse of a prophetic formula as to the false prediction of judgment on Judah's foes, which that term implied, and which buoyed the hopes of the people (cf. especially v. 33, where doubtless אַתֶּם הַמִּשַּׁא is to be restored) and blinded them to their actual situation.¹

The Versions render variously: LXX. τὸ λῆμμα² (an etymological rendering), so Theod. and Symm.; Vulg. 'onus'; Targ. כִּטְל נְבוּאָהָא; Syr. ܡܬܠܐ.

[הַמִּשַּׁא אֲשֶׁר הוּא] The same superscription again in Is. 13¹; cf. also Am. 1¹.

¹ Similarly Ez. 12¹⁰.

² So in 2 K. 9²⁵; Nah. 1¹; Jer. 23^{33, 34, 36, 38}; Zc. 9¹, 12¹; Mal. 1¹; Lam. 2¹⁴. In 2 Chr. 24²⁷, κ. οἱ υἱοὶ αὐτοῦ πάντες, κ. προσῆλθον αὐτῷ οἱ πέντε, they express a different text. In Is. 13¹, 19¹, 30⁶ they render by θρᾶσις, but in 14²⁸, 15¹, 17¹, 22¹, 23¹ by ῥῆμα (in 15¹, 22¹, 23¹ A reads θραμα, in 23¹ also N); and in 21¹.¹¹ by θραμα (in 21¹ Q has ῥῆμα). In Is. 21¹³ the clause is not expressed; in Ez. 12¹⁰ they read ὁ ἀφηγούμενος.

חֶבְקוֹק] A peculiar formation. According to the vocalisation of the Massoretic text the word would appear to be abbreviated for חֶבְרָרוֹת (cf. חֶבְרָרוֹת; יִרְמְקָ; חֶלְלָקוֹת; פֶּקֶחְקוֹ and the new Heb. בְּצִלְצוֹל), and to be connected with חֶבֶק 'embrace,' 'clasp.' Instances of the assimilation of a weaker sound to a preceding stronger sound do occur, *e.g.* קטלתו for קטלהו (cf. Ges.-K. § 19*f*), and, accordingly, חֶבְקוֹק might be similarly explained; but the form of the word has no exact analogy in Hebrew, and it must remain doubtful whether this is the correct explanation of the Massoretic vocalisation, or whether it is not to be regarded rather as an endeavour on the part of the Massoretes to represent a traditional pronunciation of what is really a loan-word in Hebrew. Frd. Delitzsch (cf. *Prol.* p. 84, *Assyr. Handwort.* p. 281) connects the name with the Assyrian ḥambaḫûku, which denotes a species of garden plant, and this derivation is supported by the form Ἀμβακούμ of the LXX. On the basis of this derivation we should have expected חֶבְקֹק¹ or חֶבְקִיק (cf. Vulg. Habacuc; Syr. ܠܒܚܩܐ); still it is not impossible that the present Massoretic punctuation is to be traced to a form which approximated more closely to the Assyrian. The name may originally have been pronounced חֶבְקִיק, with the duplication of ק in order to preserve intact the

¹ Cod. E. 3 חֶבְקִיק; Baer and Delitzsch edit. p. 77; cf. Ginsburg (smaller edit.), p. 1090.

original *a*-sound (for the retention of a vowel by the duplication of the following consonant, cf. **בָּפָה**, **בָּפָה** and the *waw* consecutive with impf., Dr. Tenses, p. 72); in this case the next stage would be the assimilation of the **מ**, namely **הַבְּקִיָּק**, which, owing to a certain stress falling on the second syllable together with the tone on the final **קִיָּק**—, was finally shortened into **הַבְּקִיָּק**.

II

1, 2-17. THE PROPHET'S COMPLAINT

vv. 2-4. The prophet complains of the trouble and mischief, the spoliation and violence, the strife and contention which fill his day. The authoritative teaching of the prophets is being seriously affected, and failure attends the efforts of the righteous.

2. **עֲרֵאנָה**] In Baer and Delitzsch's text: **עֲרֵאנָה**, with *Rāphè* over the *nun*, in order to distinguish it from the interjection **אָנָה** (cf. 2 K. 20³ = Is. 38³; Jon. 1¹⁴, 4²; Ps. 116^{4, 16}) incorrectly written for **אָנָה** (= **נָא** **אָה**).

שְׁוֹעִי] For perfect after **עֲרֵאנָה**, cf. Ex. 16^{28 1}

¹ Cf. similarly the perfect after **עֲרֵמֹתִי**, Ex. 10³; Ps. 80⁵ **עֲרֵמֹתִי** **עֲרֵמֹתִי**; but, as in the case of **עֲרֵאנָה**, the more usual construction is the impf., cf. 1 S. 1¹⁴; Ps. 74¹⁰, 82², etc.; rarely the participle, 1 K. 18²¹; 1 S. 16¹.

עֲרֹאנָה מֵאַתָּם לְשֹׁמֵר מִצְוֹתַי; elsewhere the impf., cf. Nu. 14¹¹ עֲרֹאנָה יִנָּאצְנִי הָעָם הַזֶּה וְעֲרֹאנָה לֹא יִאֲמִינוּ בִּי; Jer. 47⁶; Ps. 13^{2, 3}, 63⁴; Jb. 18², 19², *except* Jos. 18³ 'עֲרֹאנָה אַתָּם מִתְרַפִּים לְבֹא לְרִשְׁתָּ וּ' where the participle is used. The use of the perfect in such a case seems to us inappropriate; but we must remember that the Hebrew concerned himself rather with the character of the action than its order in time. Here the action is conceived as complete, though it continues on into the present: 'How long have I already called for help (and do still call)?' Which is practically equivalent to 'How long shall I call for help?' Cf. Ges.-K. § 106 *h*. The impf. הִשְׁמַע, on the other hand, states Jehovah's customary attitude every time the prophet calls for help. Similarly, אֹזֶעַק indicates something which is constantly happening: 'How long do I constantly cry out, *i.e.* how long shall I keep crying out?' Cf. Dr. *Tenses*, § 33.

[אֹזֶעַק אֵלַיךְ וּ] Either (a) 'Do I cry out . . . and Thou dost not save?'—the force of עֲרֹאנָה being understood to extend also to the following clause (so Ew., We., Now., Mar., etc.), cf. Is. 58³ לֵמָּה צִמְנוּ וְלֹא רָאִיתָ עֲנִינוּ נַפְשֵׁנוּ וְלֹא תִדְרֹךְ; or (b) affirmatively, 'I cry out . . . and Thou dost not save'—Dav., GAS. This is somewhat more emphatic.

[אֹזֶעַק . . . הַמָּס] Not 'cry out *concerning* violence,' but 'cry out, Violence!'—הַמָּס being what he cries out (so

We., Now., Mar.), cf. Hos. 8² לִי יִזְעֻקוּ אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל ; Jer. 20⁸; Jb. 19⁷ הֵן אֶזְעַק הַמָּוֶה. There is no instance of זֶעַק, in the sense of 'cry out concerning,' being followed by an accusative. For זֶעַק, with this latter meaning, cf. Jer. 30¹⁵, where it is construed with a preposition.

3. [ועמל חבית] M.T. 'And mischief beholdest,' not 'mischief causest me to behold' (Ew.), for חבית is not found with a causative meaning. For חבית 'look upon,' with accusative, cf. v. 13; Ps. 10¹⁴; Jb. 38¹¹, etc. According to the Massoretic text the prophet changes his standpoint; in cl. α^a he deprecates Jehovah's indifference to *his* witnessing evil, while in cl. α^b it is *Jehovah's* indifference to evil that he deprecates. We should have expected cl. α^b to balance the thought of cl. α^a . This might be regarded as an instance of that transition in thought which is not an unfamiliar feature in the elevated style of the prophet; but the variant renderings of the versions suggest that the text is suspicious. Moreover cl. b , though translatable as it stands, is very lame and prosaic, and most recent scholars are now agreed that the text is in some error. It is not, however, easy to see how the verse should be restored. In the ancient versions the words are differently grouped. The LXX.—*ἵνα τί ἔδειξάς μοι κόπους κ. πόνους ἐπιβλέπειν, ταλαιπωρίαν καὶ ἀσέβειαν; ἐξ ἐναντίας μου γέγονεν κρίσις, καὶ ὁ*

κριτής λαμβάνει—reading הביט for M.T. הביט and omitting the conjunction, connect שר וחמם with what precedes and construe לנני with the following words, which were apparently read לנני היה ריב ומדון ישא. Similarly the Old Lat.¹ and Syr.¹ except that the latter for the infinitive הביט (LXX.) renders a 1st pers. אביט (so Targ.). The Vulg. follows the LXX. in reading an infinitive הביט, connecting it with the following words; otherwise this version is the same as the M.T. with the possible exception of ומדון ישא, which it has perhaps read ומדון ישנא, though it may simply be a free rendering of the Hebrew. In the first part of the verse a similar grouping to what we find in LXX., Syr., Vulg. has been adopted by Wellhausen and Nowack, who cancelling ו in ושר connect שר וחמם as object to הביט. The following words ויהי ריב וג' Wellhausen leaves untranslated; and Nowack, who regards vv. ²⁻⁴ as referring to the ravages and violence shown by Judah's foes, thinks them to be the later addition of a scribe who interpreted these verses of internal evil and wrong within the Judean community. But the difficulty of inexact parallelism, though somewhat modified,

¹ Old Lat.: 'Ut quid mihi ostendisti labores et dolores, ut viderem miseriam et impietatem? Adversus me ortum est iudicium

et iudex accepit'; Syr. למנן במלכות חבלן סבלן : סמון ונן
 במלכות סבלן . סמון ונן . סמון ונן
 סמון .

would still remain; while Nowack's excision of the clause 'ויהי ריב וג' is a violent measure. Marti, who follows the Massoretic grouping of the words, adopts the Syriac reading תביט אביט for ויהי ריב וג', and for ודין ומדון; this would be an improvement; the reading אביט would bring cl. a^b into conformity with cl. a^a ; and, rhythmically, the line would be similar to v. ².

As an alternative conjecture, we might suggest that the confusion was due to an intentional alteration of the text on the part of the early scribes, and read תראה, in view of the following תביט, for תראני; such a change would not be difficult to account for; למה תראה און ועמל, we might suppose, was felt to be too bold an expression to be used in reference to Jehovah (cf. v. ¹³, which, on this explanation, might have influenced the scribes), and accordingly was modified so as to apply to the prophet.¹ Clause b would be more difficult to emend; but לנגדי, in accordance with cl. a , would probably represent לנגרך, while ויהי would either be a corruption of יהוה (cf. LXX. *γέγονεν*, which might presuppose the letters יהוה), or both it and ישא (cf. *infra*) may have been introduced into the text, after the latter had been altered and its words differently grouped.

¹ Or such an alteration might be due to the editor, who has, it would seem, changed the original text in vv. ^{5, 6a} (cf. *Introd.* pp. 29 ff), and who wished to make it clear that the present verses were to be interpreted of wrongs *within* the State.

According to this conjecture, then, the text would read:—

למה תראה און ועמל
 תביט ישד וחמם
 לנגדך [יהוה] ריב ומדון

For the combination און ועמל, cf. Ps. 55¹¹, 90¹⁰; and for אביט ישד וחמם Am. 3¹⁰; Jer. 6⁷, 20⁸; Ez. 45⁹. The change, however, which this conjecture demands is somewhat violent, and one would hesitate to adopt it without further support.

On the whole, then, it would appear to be better to follow Marti in reading אביט with the Syr. and Targ.; and then follow either the grouping of words advocated by the same scholar, or else—and this seems preferable—the grouping represented by the LXX. On this view the original text will have been:—

למה תראני און ועמל
 אביט ישד וחמם
 לנגדי ריב ומדון:

The ויהי and ישא are probably later insertions, introduced after אביט had been corrupted and a different arrangement of the words adopted. There would not appear to be sufficient reason for Marti's substitution of דין for M.T. ריב.

[ישא] If the M.T. is correct, ישא will either (1) be used intransitively, 'lift itself up'—compare for this use of נשא Hos. 13¹; Nah. 1⁵; Ps. 89¹⁰, though in all

three cases the text is suspicious; and also the Ar. ^{نَشَأَ}, 'rise,' 'be high.' Or (2) the subject may be indefinite, 'one lifts up.' Probably, however, the word did not stand in the original but has come into the text at a later time (cf. *supra*).

4. [חפוג] 'is numbed.' The word occurs again in Gen. 45³⁶ ויפג לבו ונ'; Ps. 38⁹, 77³ (*Nif'al*); and is the same as the Arab. ^{نَجَّ} = 'was cold' (in reference to the weather) II = 'cooled or refreshed oneself,' 'go into the open air.' The imperfect is frequentative. The LXX. render *διεσκέδασται* (cf. Old Lat., 'disjecta est'), apparently reading תופר, 'is frustrated,' cf. Ps. 33¹⁰, κύριος διεσκεδάξει βουλὰς ἐθνῶν = M.T. יהוה הפיר עצת גוים; similarly, Zc. 11¹⁰, Ps. 89³⁴ (88³³). But this reading is hardly to be preferred to the striking metaphor of the M.T., which is supported further by the Syr. ^{ܐܬܝܪܐ} and Targ. פנת. The Vulg. renders 'lacerata est,' which is probably a free or conjectural rendering.

[לנצח] Ew., Hitz., and Dav. understand נצח here in the sense of 'truth'; 'right goes not forth according to truth' (cf. Is. 42³ מִשְׁפַּט יוֹצִיא לְנֶצַח = 'according to truth will he bring forth judgment'); but נצח is never found with this meaning in Hebrew; nor can it be substantiated by any of the cognate languages. The use of the Ar. ^{نَصَحَ} in the sense

of 'be pure,' 'be sincere'—cf. also נָאֻס 'pure,' and נָסִיחַ 'sincere' (of a friend)—which would be the nearest approach to such a meaning, is rather derivative than original (cf. further Dr. *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel*, p. 98). In the present passage, therefore, we are scarcely justified in departing from the sense 'for ever,' the sense which נָצַח elsewhere bears in Hebrew, and we render accordingly 'and right will never go forth,' viz. so long as Jehovah refuses to intervene. The prophet speaks despairingly; so long as things continue in this state, and Jehovah fails to take notice, right will never go forth. Davidson's objection that לְנֶצַח would not mean 'never,' but 'on no occasion,' rests on a mistaken view of the verse (cf. *Introd.* p. 24 n).

[כִּי רָשָׁע] The Massoretic punctuation is supported by all ancient versions (LXX. ἀσεβής; Old Lat. and Vulg. 'impious'; Syr. ܪܫܝܥ; Targ. רשעיא). If this punctuation represents the original vocalisation, רָשָׁע will be used collectively without the article. A word used in the singular and without the article, as a collective, is, of course, of very common occurrence, especially in poetry and elevated style (cf. e.g. 11¹³; Is. 11⁴; Jb. 15²⁰, 34¹⁷, etc.). In the present passage, however, where רָשָׁע stands in close proximity to הַצְדִּיק with the article, we should have

expected the article to have been used; for, without going perhaps so far as to assert that רשע *must* in such a connection have the article, we do find elsewhere uniformity as to the use of the article, when רשע and צדיק either occur together in the same clause, or when they stand contrasted in parallel clauses. The following instances will illustrate this usage¹:—
 (a) with the article, Gen. 18²⁵ והיה בצדיק ברשע; Ex. 9²⁷; Dt. 25¹ והצדיקו את-הרשע והרשעו את-הצדיק; (b) without the article, Gen. 18^{23, 25} להמית צדיק עם-רשע; Ex. 23⁷; 1 K. 8³² ולהצדיק צדיק . . . ולהרשע רשע. In the present passage, therefore, רשע without the article must be regarded as exceptional; and, considering the weight of evidence (cf. footnote) for uniformity of usage as to the article in such a case, it seems difficult to resist the supposition that

¹ The following list is as complete as possible:—

(a) רשע and צדיק, both with the article: Ez. 33¹²; Eccl. 3¹⁷, 8¹⁴, 9² (also the passages quoted above); (b) both without the article: 2 S. 4¹¹; Is. 5²³; Hab. 1¹³; Ez. 3¹⁸⁻²¹, 13²², 18²⁴ and 27, 21^{8, 9}; Ps. 1⁶, 7¹⁰, 11⁵, 13⁵, 34²², 37²¹, 68^{3b} and 4a, 75¹¹ (cf. Ps. 147⁶); Pr. 2²¹ and 22, 3³³, 10³, 6, 7, 11, 16, 20, 24, 25, 28, 30, 31, 11^{8, 10, 23, 31} (cf. also 11^{5, 11}), 12^{5, 7, 10, 12, 26} (cf. 12⁶), 13^{9, 25}, 14^{19, 32} (cf. 14¹¹), 15^{6, 23} (cf. 15⁸), 17¹⁵, 18⁵, 21^{12, 29}, 24^{15, 16}, 25²⁶, 28^{1, 12, 28}, 29¹⁶; Eccl. 7¹⁵, 8¹⁴; Jb. 9²² (cf. also Is. 53⁹). The only apparent exceptions that have been noticed occur in Ps. 37^{12, 16, 32}, 58¹¹; Pr. 12²¹, 21¹⁸; Ez. 18²⁰. In Ps. 37^{12, 16, 32}; Pr. 12²¹, 21¹⁸, the dissimilarity rests on the *Massoretic* punctuation, and may, therefore, not be original; in Ps. 58¹¹ the הרשע is rendered definite by the context; Ez. 18²⁰ צדקת הצדיק עליו ותהיה ורשעת צדקת הצדיק עליו רשע if the M.T. is correct, would be an exceptional case, but the marginal reading has הרשע, and it is very probable that either this should be adopted, or else with the LXX. (B)—δακαὶσὺν τῷ δακαίῳ ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἐστὶν, κ. ἀνομία ἀνέμψ ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἐστὶν—*we should read* רשע רשעת צדיק . . . צדקת הצדיק.

καταδυναστεύει is found in 2 S. 8¹¹; Ne. 5⁵ for Heb. כְּבִישׁ, which would orthographically be the nearest approach to the word in the text, but it is doubtful whether they actually read this word here; and, on the whole, *καταδυναστεύει* seems best explained as a free rendering of M.T. מִכְתִּיר. Cf. Pr. 14¹⁸ (LXX.). In any case the M.T. מִכְתִּיר is certainly to be retained; and so far from being weak when brought into connection with רָשָׁע, which, as we have seen above, is most probably the original vocalisation, admirably expresses the prophet's sentiments. 'Right' will never go forth, the prophet argues, for the righteous, who might be expected to carry it through, are unable to do so; wickedness *encompasses* them, and renders them helpless in their endeavours. v.^{4b} at the same time indirectly argues for the intervention of a Higher Power; as the righteous only fail in their attempt to constitute right, there remains but one solution, namely, Jehovah's intervention.

וּמִשְׁפָּט לִנְצָח מִעַקֵּל [עַל-כֵּן יֵצֵא מ' מִעַקֵּל] is an accusative of condition, describing the state in which מִשְׁפָּט goes forth (cf. Ges.-K. § 118 *m-p*). The clause is not, with Nowack, to be cancelled as a scribal insertion, which merely repeats the thought of cl. *a*^β; nor is it necessary, with Marti, to suppose some confusion in the text of cl. *a*^β and cl. *b*^β, and to read מִשְׁפָּט לִנְצָח מִעַקֵּל. The clause forms the complement to cl. *b*^a, which

is required no less by the parallelism than by the context. Wickedness beleaguers the righteous and thwarts their purpose, with the result that right is bent away from its course.

v. 5. The prophet now turns to the main subject of his complaint—the Chaldean. He describes the surprise and astonishment which they are causing among the peoples.

5. [ראו בניִים'והב'] For a similar phrase, cf. Lam. 1¹² וְהִבִּיטָה יְיָ, 2²⁰; cf. also Is. 63¹⁵; Ps. 80¹⁵; Jb. 35⁵; and for ראה ב = 'look at,' cf. Ps. 64⁹; Jb. 3⁹; 2 Chr. 7³. The M.T. בניִים is supported by the Vulg. 'in gentibus' and Targ. בעממא; the LXX., however, read οἱ καταφρονῆται, and the Syr. سافرن, rendering בנרים (or הבנרים). The latter reading is adopted by Now., Mar., etc. The text of this verse, however, is probably not original; for the proposed reading, cf. pp. 29 ff.

[והתמהו תמהו] (*si ver. lect.*) = 'And astonish yourselves, be astonished.' The *Hithpa'el* התמהו occurs only here. The combination התמהו and תמהו is somewhat strange; and the text seems to be in some error. We might suppose that תמהו is an accidental repetition of the preceding consonants, but the parallelism emphatically demands a second verb. In Is. 29⁹ the phrase התמהמהו ותמהו occurs as an expression of astonishment, and it is possible that

this was the original text here (so We., Mar.). This supposition is favoured by the Targ., which renders Is. 29⁹ and this passage similarly by אֲתַרְפוּ שׁוֹהוּ.¹ The LXX.—κ. θαυμάσατε θαυμάσια κ. ἀφανίσθητε—have a doublet: θαυμάσια=infin. absol. תָּמָה (cf. Jos. 24¹⁰, κ. εὐλογίαν εὐλόγησεν ἡμᾶς=M.T. וַיְבָרֵךְ בְּרוּךְ אַתְּכֶם, and compare especially Num. 23¹¹ with Num. 24¹⁰ (LXX.))—the latter being the more usual rendering of the Heb. infin. absol.), and κ. ἀφανίσθητε apparently=תִּפְחוּ or תִּפְחוּ. For the proposed reading, cf. pp. 29 ff.

[כִּי-פָעַל פֻּעַל וּג'] For a similar expression, cf. Ps. 44² פֻּעַל פֻּעַל בְּיָמֶיהָ. v. ^{6a} as it now stands would point to the 1st pers. sing. as the subject of פָּעַל; some scholars,² however, would understand the 3rd pers. sing. as subject, 'He worketh,' viz. Jehovah; or the subject might possibly be indefinite, 'one worketh' (so R.Vm.), but the indefinite use of the participle in the *singular* is quite exceptional. Cf. Ju. 13¹⁹ וּמַפְלֵא לַעֲשׂוֹת, where, however, the text is very doubtful (v. Moore, *Inter. Comm.*), and (perhaps) Mal. 1¹¹. Compare further Dav. *Syn.* § 108 (c) and Rem. 3; Ges.-K. § 144 i. On the other hand, the

¹ The Syr. and Vulg. also render these two passages similarly, though they reverse the order of the words. In the present passage the Syr.=ܫܠܡܬܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ; in Is. 29⁹=ܫܠܡܬܐ ܕܡܠܟܐ. The Vulg. here = 'admiramini et obstupescite'; in Is. 29⁹= 'obstupescite et admiramini.

² Ew., Now.

omission of the 3rd pers. pron. with the participle is not unfrequent (cf. Gen. 24³⁰ וְהָיָה עֲמִיר וְג' 1 S. 10¹¹; Ges.-K. § 116 s). The instances, however, are such that the 3rd pers. may readily be inferred from the context, and this could hardly be said to be the case here. Moreover, in the present context the change of person would be very unnatural, and the following M.T. הָנִי מְקִים וְג' would strongly desiderate a 1st pers. The LXX.—ἐργον ἐγὼ ἐργάζομαι—evidently read a 1st pers. sing., and it is more than probable that the latter was intended here by the editor; in this case the omission of the pronoun is anomalous. The instances quoted in Ges.-K. § 116 s, viz. Zc. 9¹²; Mal. 2¹⁶, are questionable. In the latter passage שָׁנֵאתִי is most probably to be restored, while in the former (*si ver. lect.*) the subject has previously been named. It would therefore—on the supposition that the verse is original—be better on the authority of the LXX. either to insert אֲנִי or to read אֲפַעַל.¹ But the anomaly in the M.T. is in reality an indication that the text is not original, and, as we have previously said, in its present form it is probably due to a later editor (cf. pp. 29 ff.).

וְג' אֲנִי הָאֲמִינוּ כִּי either with a concessive force, 'though' (cf. Jer. 4³⁰, 49¹⁶, etc.), or, according to the

¹ The Syr. **ܐܢܝ** expresses a 1st pers. The Vulg. = 'opus factum est'; Targ. = **עוֹבְדָא אֲתַעֲבִיד**, pointing either the second **פַּעַל** as a passive participle, or else as **פָּעַל**, understanding it impersonally.

present text, it may simply = 'that' (cf. Jb. 9¹⁶ לא יאמין כי יאזין קולי). On the proposed change in the text, cf. pp. 29 ff.

vv. 6-11. A graphic description of the Chaldeans' character and the conquests they have achieved.

[ביהנני מקים אתהבשרים] An example of the *futurum instans*. Cf. Am. 6¹⁴; 2 S. 12¹¹; Gen. 9⁹ (with a different meaning). The clause in its present form is probably editorial (cf. pp. 29 ff.). According to the proposed reading, הבשרים will be a *casus pendens* resumed by הוא in v. 7 (the singular in agreement with הגוי).

[הגוי המרוג] Cf. Ju. 18²⁵ פריפגעו בכם אנשים קרי נפש; 2 S. 17⁸ כי גבורים המה ומרי נפש המה; and with a different nuance, 1 S. 22²; Pr. 31⁶; Jb. 3²⁰.

[הנמהר] Lit. 'that hastens itself,' i.e. impetuous. Cf. Is. 32⁴ (where it is equivalent to 'hasty,' as in Jb. 5¹³), and also the use of the *Pi'el* in Is. 59⁶; Pr. 1¹⁶. In Is. 35⁴ נמהרילב, the only other instance of the *Nif'al*, it is the passive sense that is prominent, viz. 'be hurried in heart,' i.e. agitated.

[למרחבי ארץ] ל of norm = 'according to the breadths of the earth,' i.e. far and wide. Cf. Gen. 13¹⁷ התהלך בארץ לארכה ולרחבה, v. 3; Ex. 17¹; Dt. 10¹¹ קום לך (v. Oxf. Lex. sub ל, p. 516 a). The phrase מרחבי ארץ only here.

לרשת משכנות ל with infin. constr. expressing purpose—a common construction (cf. 2^{1, 9}; Gen. 28⁴; Dt. 9^{1, 4, 5} and often).

[משכנות לא-לו] For similar instances of the combination of לא and personal pronoun (possessive) in what is virtually a relative clause, cf. Gen. 15¹³ בארץ לא בארץ לא לכם; Pr. 26¹⁷. Compare also Hb. 2⁶; Jb. 26^{2a}, 39¹⁶ (very condensed modes of expression); Ewald, *Syn.* § 332 a; Ges.-K. § 155 e; Dav. *Syn.* § 143 (a).

7. [אִים] Only again in Cant. 6^{4, 10}. The verb אִים is not found in Biblical Hebrew, nor does it occur in the cognate languages, but a *Pi'el* אִים occurs in late Hebrew (Talmud, etc.). The derivative אִימה, however, is frequently found in Biblical literature.

[נורא] 'fearful.' *Nif'al* participle with force of Latin adjective in—*bilis* (cf. נְחָמָר = 'desirable'; נַעֲרָן 'terrible'; נְתָעַב 'abominable,' etc.; Ges.-K. § 116 e; Dav. *Syn.* 97, R. 1). The LXX. read ἐπιφανής = נראה. The Syr., Vulg., Targ. support M.T.

[וַיִּשְׁאוּ] 'and his dignity.' Cf. Gen. 49³ וַיִּשְׁאוּ; Ps. 62⁵; Jb. 13¹¹, 31²³. In Lev. 13 and 14, the word is used in a physical sense, 'swelling.' The LXX. render τὸ πλῆγμα αὐτοῦ (an etymological rendering); Vulg. 'onus ejus'; Syr. סַגְסַג; Targ. גִּזְרִיתָּהּ.

[משפטו ושאתו יצא] singular, although the subject is compound and consists of two words. This may be explained either on the ground that משפטו and ושאתו really form one conception, and are therefore construed with the singular, or else agreement is made with שאתו only (cf. Hos. 4¹¹ and Dav. *Syn.* § 114 a). In the present case, however, it is possible that the text may be slightly in error, and that we should read יצאו, in which case the ו may have accidentally become separated from יצא and been prefixed to וקלו, or it may have fallen out on account of the following ו in וקלו.

8. [וקלו מנמרים] Cf. 2 S. 1²³; Jer. 4¹³. Elsewhere the leopard is compared for its keen sight (cf. Hos. 13⁷; Jer. 5⁶); or for its spots (Jer. 13²³). The Syr. מנשרים = סלע נעיל.

[מואבי ערב] Cf. Zeph. 3³ שפטיה ואבי ערב; Jer. 5⁶. The LXX. render ὑπὲρ τ. λύκους τ. Ἀραβίας, pointing ערב for M.T. ערב; so again in Zeph. 3³ (just quoted).

[ופשו וג'] The root פוש occurs again only in Jer. 50¹¹ כעגלה דשא (Qr. תפוש) and Mal. 3²⁰ ויצאתם ופשתם כעגלי מרבק.¹ The word is unknown in the cognate languages,² and its meaning can only be conjectured. It has been variously rendered in

¹ In Nah. 3¹⁸ a נפשו נפשו occurs, but this is either a synonym of פוש or an error for it.

² פוש in Aram. is a distinct root.

וּפְרָשִׁיו וְ] פְרָשִׁיו following directly on פְּרָשִׁיו is very harsh, and can hardly be correct. Moreover, this half of the verse as it stands is overloaded ; what we expect is not three clauses but two, corresponding to the number of clauses in the first half of the verse. The LXX. and Syr. do not express פְּרָשִׁיו, and it can scarcely be doubted that it is an accidental repetition of the preceding פְּרָשִׁיו. The following יבֹאוּ should, then, most probably be cancelled ; it is lame, and not expressed either in the Syr. or LXX. (*κ. ὀρμησουσιν* can scarcely be regarded as a free translation). As G. A. Smith has suggested, it was probably inserted by a scribe who wished to supply the second פְּרָשִׁיו with a verb. By striking out וּפְרָשִׁיו and יבֹאוּ the line will be relieved, but even then the text is suspicious ; for, as we have already seen, the reading וּפָשׁוּ is peculiar, and hardly seems correct. The LXX.—*κ. ἐξιπιάσονται . . . κ. ὀρμησουσιν*—express two verbs, and it is not improbable that their text contained a conflate reading. The word *ἐξιπιάσονται* evidently corresponds to the M.T. וּפָשׁוּ, while *ὀρμησουσιν* represents probably a different reading. In Ju. 20³⁷, LXX. (A) reads τὸ ἔνδρον ὥρμησεν (= M.T. והארבה חִישׁוֹ), where *ὀρμᾶν* is equivalent to חָשׂ, and it is not unlikely that the LXX. are rendering וּחָשׂ here. If this conjecture is correct, then *ὀρμησουσιν* would point to וּחָשׂוּ as the original reading, which has retained its place in the LXX. alongside a later and corrupt reading. This would

yield a suitable meaning, and we may accept it at least tentatively in place of the obscure ופשו. The line will accordingly read:—

והשו פרושו מרחוק יעפו בנשר חט לאכל

[בנשר חט לאכל] For a similar expression, cf. Jb. 9²⁶. בְּנִשָּׁר not בְּנִשָּׁר for the article is, as a rule, not found when the object of comparison is represented in a particular condition or aspect (cf. Dt. 32¹¹; Jer. 8⁶, 14⁹, 20¹¹; Ps. 42², 78⁶⁵, 88⁵; Cant. 1⁰ מִצֵּא מִרְעָה; Jb. 9²⁶, etc.). The usage, however, is not uniform, and we find the article used in similar cases—*e.g.* compare Dt. 32¹¹ with Is. 61¹⁰, and Jer. 12⁸ with Is. 63¹³—though the cases are usually (not always; cf. *e.g.* Is. 63¹³, just quoted) such that the additional clause describes a general rather than a particular characteristic, and would, therefore, more readily admit of the article being employed with the object of comparison. Compare further Dav. *Syn.* § 29, R. 2; Ges.-K. § 126 *p*; Oxf. Lex. p. 208 *a*.

9. כָּלָה] LXX. συντέλεια, punctuating כָּלָה as in v. 15.

לְחַמֵּם] LXX. εἰς ἀσβεῖς, punctuating לְחַמֵּם.

מִנְמַח קְדִימָה] A very difficult clause. מִנְמַח is quite uncertain. Gesenius understood the word to mean ‘assembling’—‘the assembling of their faces is (directed) forwards’—connecting the word

with the root נָמַם = Ar. جَمَّ 'become much.' Ewald regarded it as akin to the Arabic جَامَّ 'seek' (cf. also נָמַם 'swallow'), and assigned to it the meaning of 'eagerness'; but this derivation is far-fetched and extremely doubtful. If the text is correct, Gesenius' explanation would philologically be the easier, but the sense is peculiar. Moreover, קְרִימָה elsewhere means only 'eastward' and not 'forwards'—as it must apparently mean, if the words are correct. It can hardly be doubted that the text as it stands is in some disorder. The versions offer various renderings: the LXX. express ἀνθεστηκότας (agreeing with the preceding ἀσεβείς, v. *supra*) προσώποις αὐτῶν ἐξ ἐναντίας, ἀνθεστηκότας will either be a conjectural rendering or else, perhaps, some form of קוּם, while ἐξ ἐναντίας evidently represents the consonants קרמת (cf. Jos. 19¹² ἐξ ἐναντίας ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν βαιθσάμυς = M.T. קרמת מזרח השמים, similarly v. 13; 1 S. 13⁵ ἐξ ἐναντίας = M.T. קרמת); the Syr. ܡܢܡܬ ܩܪܡܬ, perhaps reading מראת for מנמת (or it may simply be a conjectural rendering), while ܡܢܡܬ is apparently paraphrastic; the Vulg. renders 'facies eorum ventus eorum,' omitting מנמת and reading קרים, 'east wind.' The Targ. paraphrases by מקבל אפיהון דמן כרוח קרים קדומא, similarly Symm. ἡ πρόσοψις τοῦ προσώπου αὐτῶν ἀνεμος καυσῶν; in both renderings the meaning assigned to מנמת is apparently conjectural. The versions, it will be

seen, afford little or no help, and we are thus left to conjecture what the original text was. Judging from the first and last clauses, it would seem evident that this clause was intended to give some further information as to *what the Chaldean does*, rather than a description of *what he is*. In this case it is not unlikely that the clause introduced a climax on the preceding line בלה לחמם יבוא, and it would not be difficult to see in the first two letters of מנמת an inversion of נם. If this supposition is correct, we may suggest as a possible emendation of the text: קדימה. נם-יפנה (or יתפנה) יָמָה וְקֶדְמָה (or קדימה): ימה naturally suggests ימה, while the letters [מ] תפנ [יהם] would seem to point to a *Hithpa'el* form of פנה; but, as the *Hithpa'el* is nowhere else found, perhaps the original reading was the *Qal* יפנה. The second מ in מנמת may possibly be a correction of the preceding מנ, wrongly written for נם, while the bracketed יהם would be a corruption of ימה. The meaning, 'Yea, he turns himself (or turns) west and east,' *i.e.* everywhere, would not be unsuitable, and is just the kind of clause that the following words would presuppose. For the order ימה וקדמה, cf. Gen. 28¹⁴.

[ויאסף בחול ונ'] Cf. 1 S. 13⁵; 2 S. 17¹¹.

10. [יתקלם] 'scoff at.' Only again in 2 K. 23³; Ez. 22⁵, 16³¹ (*Pi'el*).

[מישחק] Only here.

[וילכרה] Fem. suff. referring to מבצר, which, however, is masculine (cf. Is. 17⁸). Such a grammatical inaccuracy is not uncommon in the case of a masc. suff. referring back to a feminine substantive (cf. Gen. 31⁹; Ex. 1²¹, 2¹⁷; Ges.-K. § 135 o); but the reverse is quite exceptional. In this instance the fem. suff. might conceivably be explained as referring to an implicit עיר מבצר being virtually equivalent to עיר מב' (v. Now.; and cf. 1 S. 6¹⁸; 2 K. 10², 17⁹, 18⁸, etc.); but it is doubtful whether this is the true explanation. It seems better, on the whole, to regard the anomaly either as due to the Massoretes, who pointed the ה as fem. (ה־) instead of masc. ה־, or as a scribal error for ה־. The latter explanation is perhaps preferable, as the form of suff. ה־ in the case of an imperfect would be isolated in Hebrew. The form ה־, however, is found (exceptionally) with the imperfect (cf. Hos. 8³; 1 S. 18¹, etc.), and ה־ with the perfect (cf. Ex. 32²⁵; Num. 23⁸), and in the Moabite Inscription also with the imperfect (cf. line 6 ויחלפה, also line 19 ויגרשה).

11. [אז חלה רוח] 'then he passes on as wind'; רוח, if correct, must be understood as an accusative of condition, describing the condition or manner in which he passes on. In Hebrew usage, however, this accusative is generally confined to cases in which the condition, expressed by the adjective, participle, or substantive, is not simply one of

resemblance, but one of *exact correspondence*. In the former case Hebrew idiom usually employs the prep. כ; thus *e.g.* Lev. 19¹⁶ לֹא תֵלֵךְ רֵבִיל; Mic. 2³ לֹא תִלְכוּ רוּמָה; but Ob. 4 אִם תִּנְבִּיאוּ בְנִשְׁרָא. In Arabic, however, this use of the accusative (البحال) is much more extensive, and we find it employed in the most varied relations (cf. *e.g.* كَرَزِيدَ اسْدَا, and other examples quoted by Wright, *Ar. Gram.* ii. pp. 114 ff.). Traces of this more extensive use of the accusative also occur sporadically (in elevated prose and poetry) in Hebrew (cf. Is. 21³ וַיִּקְרָא אֲרִיָּה; Jb. 24⁵ וְהֵן פְּרָאִים), and the present instance is perhaps to be reckoned among the number; still it may be doubted whether, with Wellhausen, ברוח should not rather be read. Gr., Now. propose וַיַּחֲלִיף בַּח after Is. 40³¹, but there does not seem sufficient reason for departing thus from the received text. LXX. μεταβαλεῖ τὸ πνεῦμα, Syr. ܠܡܬܒܝܬ ܕܠܗ, Vulg. ‘mutabitur spiritus’—assigning to חָלַף the meaning which the root usually bears in Aramaic. The Targ. paraphrases על דרמה רוחיה עלוהי. For או introducing and emphasising a special feature in a description, cf. Gen. 49⁶; Ex. 15¹⁵; Is. 41⁴.—Oxf. Lex. *sub* או.

[וְאִשָּׁם] So Syr., Targ., and (perhaps) LXX.¹ The *waw* is the *waw copulative*, and not *waw consecu-*

¹ ἐξιλίσσεται; this usually renders M.T. כִּפַּר. The LXX. may have punctuated וְאִשָּׁם, understanding it as a *Pi'el privatum*.

tive. This is found in cases where the writer wishes to represent two facts as co-ordinate with one another, to 'exhibit the second as simultaneous with the first rather than as succeeding it' (Dr. *Tenses*, §§ 131, 132), and the present passage is probably, if M.T. is correct, a case in point. The reading of M.T., however, it must be admitted, is somewhat unexpected in the present connection; what we expect is some further description of what the Chaldean does rather than a statement of what he is or becomes. The Vulg. 'corrue't' would perhaps point to some form of שָׁמַם 'lay waste,' which would suggest וַיִּשָּׁמ or וַיִּשָּׁמ. This would not yield an unsuitable meaning. Gr., We., Now., Mar., propose וַיִּשָּׁמ, connecting it with the following clause. The conjecture is attractive, but, in the present case, וַיִּשָּׁמ, or whatever text it represents, seems certainly to complete the description of the preceding terms, and the וַי to begin a new clause. On the other hand, if וַיִּשָּׁמ stood originally in the text, it would not be difficult to see how, under the influence of the following clause, it might at a later time be corrupted into וַיִּשָּׁמ.

וַיִּשָּׁמ here conforms to its more original use as a demonstrative (cf. Ps. 12⁸); elsewhere it is employed as a relative (cf. Ex. 15^{3, 16}; Is. 43²¹; Ps. 142⁴, etc.). וַי is best understood as a *casus pendens*, resumed by the suffix in כִּהוּ: 'This one

—his strength is his god,' rather than as a case of apposition: 'This his strength, etc.' The former is more emphatic, and at the same time accords better with the grammatical usage of **זֶה** and **זֹאת** (yet cf. Ex. 32¹; Jos. 9^{12, 13}). The clause apparently means that he recognises no higher power than his own personal strength; it alone dictates his course of action.

אלהו] The sing. **אלוה** occurs only here with a suffix, and it may be doubted whether it represents the original text, and whether, on the other hand, **אלהיו** should not rather be restored. In late prose **אלוה** was used with reference to a heathen god (cf. 2 Chr. 32¹⁵; Dan. 11³⁷), and this, together with the desire perhaps to preserve assonance with the preceding **י** and **י** sounds, may have influenced the present Massoretic reading. The LXX. express *αὐτῆς ἡ ἰσχύς* τ. *θεῶ μου*, omitting the suffix in **כחו** and reading **לאלהי**—a dogmatic change.

v. 12. The prophet's assurance in Jehovah. It is not to deprive them of their national existence, but for judgment, that He has appointed the Chaldean.

12. מקדם] Cf. Mic. 5¹; Ps. 74¹² **מלכי מקדם** ; **וואלהים** ; LXX. (Q) *ἀπ' ἀρχῆς μου*—the suffix accidentally arising from the following *yôd* in **יהוה**. It seems, on the whole, better to regard the **מקדם** as predicate, and not, as most commentators do **יהוי**; for it is

doubtful whether the text in that case would not have read 'הוא מקדם וג' (cf. Ps. 74¹², quoted above).

[יהוה אלֹהֵי קִדְשִׁי] LXX. (B) Κύριε ὁ θεὸς ὁ ἅγιός μου = יהוה אלֹהֵי קִדְשִׁי. MS. A, however, inserts μου after θεός.

[לֹא נִמּוֹת] According to Jewish tradition this is a *Tikkun Sopherim* or scribal emendation for נִמּוֹת. This latter reading is supported by the Targ. מִיִּמְרֵךְ קִים. לעֲלֵמִין יהוה. The LXX., Vulg., however, express the M.T. The Syr. strangely ܢܠܢ ܢܡܝܬܝܢ ܐܠܗܝܢ. See Barnes, *Journal of Theol. Stud.* vol. i. pp. 387 ff.

[לְמִשְׁפַּט וג'] ל marking the aim or object 'for judgment' (cf. v. 9. לחַמֵּם; Gen. 1¹⁶; 2 S. 15²; Jb. 7²⁰, etc.—Oxf. Lex. *sub* ל, p. 515 a).

[וְצוּר וג'] 'and, Rock, to correct hast Thou appointed him.' For צוּר used absolutely of God, cf. Dt. 32⁴, 18, 37, and with suff. Ps. 18³, 47 (= 2 S. 22³, 47^a), 19¹⁵, 28¹, 92¹⁶, 144¹, etc. The LXX.—κ. ἐπλασέν με τοῦ ἐλέγχειν παιδείαν αὐτοῦ—read וְ(י)צוּר(נִי) for M.T. וְצוּר, and apparently יִסְרוֹתוֹ for M.T. יִסְרוֹתוֹ (though the form יִסְרוֹתוֹ is found nowhere in Hebrew), cf. Syr. ܐܬܝܬܝܢܝ ܠܥܠܡܝܢܝܢ ܕܥܝܢܝܢܝܢ; both these versions express the suffix of the 1st pers. sing., which would point to צוּרִי. The suffix might be expected, but it is not necessary. צוּר without *wasu* would be an improvement (cf. Now.).

The latter might easily have arisen from the preceding שָׁמְרוּ; the conjunction, however, is expressed in all the versions.

vv. 13-16. The prophet's difficulty. Why should Jehovah, though He has raised up the Chaldean for judgment, be indifferent to a treacherous foe who are dragging men—more in the right than themselves—into their net like fishes, and who fail to see in their successes His hand but, on the contrary, deify their own might?

13. [טָהוּר עֵינַיִם] 'pure in eyes'—gen. of specification (cf. Is. 6⁵ טָהוּר שְׂפָתַי; Ps. 24⁴; Pr. 22¹¹; Jb. 17¹⁰, etc.—Dav. *Syn.* § 24 (d); Ges.-K. § 128 *x*).

[מֵרָאוֹת רָע] The מֵן may be construed in two ways: either (1) 'away from seeing,' *i.e.* so that Thou art not able to see—expressing idiomatically a negative consequence (cf. Gen. 27¹ וְחִבְהִין עֵינָיו מֵרָאוֹת; 1 S. 8⁷ אֲחִי מֵאִסּוֹ מִמֶּלֶךְ עֲלֵיהֶם; Is. 24¹⁰, etc.—Ges.-K. § 119 *x*); or else (2) it may express the idea of 'too much for' (the comparative מֵן), viz. 'too pure in eyes to see evil' (cf. Gen. 4¹³ נָדוּל עֵינִי מִנִּשּׂאָה 30⁷, and often; cf. Ges.-K. § 133 *e*).

[וְהִבִּיט וְ] For order, cf. Is. 57²⁰ הִשְׁקֹט לֹא יוּכַל; Jer. 49¹⁰ וְנִחְבָּה לֹא יוּכַל (pointing נִחְבָּה for M.T. נִחְבָּה); Jb. 4². יָכַל in Hebrew is transitive, and may therefore be construed with an accusative (cf. Gen. 44¹;

probable that בריא should be restored here, ה having arisen through dittography from the following העל-כן.

v. 17. The prophet's question. Are they continually to destroy nations and spare not?

[העל-כן וג'] The M.T. will mean 'will he therefore (*i.e.* since matters stand thus, and excess and exultation meet everywhere the advancing conqueror) empty his net' (*viz.* for other draughts). Giesebrecht, however, followed by We., Now., GAS., Dr., Mar., read העולם יריק חרבו. And there is much to be said for this emendation; for, though חרם might quite well be connected with יריק, and is also suggested by the preceding metaphor, להרג strongly suggests חרמו for חרבו, which is favoured also by the following יריק (*cf.* Ex. 15⁹; Lev. 26³³; Ez. 5^{2, 12}). Moreover, the parallelism would suggest a word similar to עולם rather than על-כן, which, following on its occurrence in v. 15^b and v. 16, is somewhat lame. We are, accordingly, inclined to accept Giesebrecht's emendation, though for עולם it would perhaps be better to read לעולם, which is the usual phrase. The LXX.—ἀμφιβαλεῖ τ. ἀμφίβληστρον αὐτοῦ—is probably a free rendering of M.T., ἀμφιβαλεῖ being no doubt suggested by the following ἀμφίβληστρον.

[להרג וג'] M.T. (*si ver. lect.*) 'will be continually for killing'—an example of the so-called periphrastic future (*cf.* Hos. 9¹³ ואפרים להוציא אלהורג בניו; Is. 10³²

עד היום בנב לעמד ; Ps. 32⁹, 49¹⁵, etc.—Ges.-K. § 114 *h-k* ; Dr. *Tenses*, § 204). The Syr. has a different division ; omitting ו, it connects תמיד with what precedes (cf. Targ.), and for להרג it reads והרג (והרג). The omission of ו has been adopted by Guthe, who proposes העל-כן יריק הרב תמיד להרג. The M.T. division, however, seems preferable. Wellhausen would read either an impf. יהרג as in cl. *a* (so Now., GAS., Dr., Mar.), or else יחרל for יחמל. The impf. יהרג is suggested by the preceding יריק, and may quite well be the original reading. The LXX., Vulg., however, support M.T.

[לא יחמל] A short circum. cl. 'without sparing' (cf. Lev. 1¹⁷ ; Is. 30¹⁴ ; Ps. 35⁸.—Dr. *Tenses*, § 162 ; Ges.-K. § 156 *g*).

III

2, 1-5.

JEHOVAH'S ANSWER

v. 1. Standing like a watchman on his outlook tower, the prophet awaits his answer.

[מישמרתי] 'place of watching,' 'outlook' (cf. Is. 21⁸ (ועל-מישמרתי אנכי נצב וג').

[אעמדה ואתיצבה . . . ואצפה] The cohortatives express the prophet's resolution: 'I will stand, etc.' For a similar use of the cohortative, cf. Gen. 11⁷ הבה נרדה ונבלה שם שפחם ; Ps. 7¹⁸, 9² and often ; cf. Dr. *Tenses*,

§ 49; Ges.-K. § 108 *b*. **אֲחִיצְבָּה** is a stronger word than **אֶעֱמְדָה**, and means 'to take one's stand,' 'station oneself' (cf. Ar. **وَصَّبَ** 'be assiduous,' 'constant'). Thus *e.g.* it is used of 'taking one's stand' in battle (cf. 1 S. 17¹⁶ **וַיִּתְּצֵב אַרְבָּעִים יוֹם**; Ps. 2² **יִתְּצֵבוּ מַלְכֵי אֶרֶץ**); or, of taking up some particular position (cf. Ex. 19¹⁷ **וַיִּתְּצֵב עַל דֶּרֶךְ לֹא-עַל**, and with **טוֹב**, and the present passage). In a narrower sense it is used especially of 'taking up one's position before some one,' *i.e.* presenting oneself before (cf. Ex. 8¹⁶ **וַהֲתִיצֵב לִפְנֵי פֶרַעַה**, 9¹³; Jos. 24¹, etc.).

מִצּוֹר 'entrenchment,' 'rampart' (cf. Zc. 9³; Ps. 31²²). The imagery seems to be that of a city entrenched against the invasion of a foe. The prophet pictures himself as one of the watchmen on the outlook, waiting for some answer to the perplexities which have arisen in connection with the rapid advance of the Chaldeans. The terms, however, are usually explained of the prophetic watch-tower (cf. Is. 21⁶) upon which the prophet in imagination stands and waits his answer; but **מִצּוֹר** would hardly be expected in such a connection. This difficulty has been felt by most modern commentators. Wellhausen, accordingly, would derive the word from **נָצַר** (there would, however, be no other instance of this derivative in Hebrew). Gr., Now. propose **מִצְפָּה**; Ew. **מִצּוֹר**; Buhl **מִצְדָּר**.¹ And if the usual interpretation

¹ Cf. Targ. **מִצְדָּר** על-מִצְדָּרָתִי.

be accepted, one or other of these emendations seems certainly to be desiderated. But perhaps it is hardly necessary to depart from the M.T.; the imagery suggested is not unlikely in the present connection, where we have described immediately before the invasion and ravages of the Chaldean. The M.T. **מַצֹּר** is supported further by the Vulg. 'super munitionem'; the LXX. ἐπὶ πύργων, however, seem to have read **עֲלֵי צוּר**; similarly the Syr. **ܠܥܠܝ ܥܝܪ**.

[**מִהִידְבְּרֵי ב**] For **דְּבַר ב**, cf. Num. 12^{2, 6, 8}; 2 S. 23²; 1 K. 22²⁸ (= 2 Chr. 18²⁷); Hos. 1²; and (in ptcp. *Qal*) Zc. 1⁹ **הַדְּבַר בִּי**, so vv. 13, 14, 22⁷, 4^{1, 4, 5, 10, 6⁴}. The original meaning of the phrase is uncertain. It is usually explained with Ewald on the analogy of **שָׂחַק ב** 'play with,' *i.e.* use as a plaything (Jb. 40²⁹); **עָבַד ב** 'labour with,' *i.e.* use as a slave. Accordingly, **דְּבַר ב** would mean prop. 'speak with,' *i.e.* use as a speaker, the prep. **ב** marking the instrument by which the speaking is, as it were, effected. This is not an improbable explanation, for the subject is always God or His angel, and most of the passages suggest the divine communication of a message *through* a prophet to others. Still the latter is not necessarily the case; in the passages in Num. (esp. v. 6 and v. 8) the point emphasised seems to be God's direct revelation to Moses, rather than His using Moses as an instrument of revelation, though this latter idea may be included. And in Zc.

the obvious meaning conveyed by the expression would appear to be that of direct converse—a speaking with or to. In view of this it seems doubtful, therefore, whether after all this is the true explanation of the phrase, and whether it did not originally convey a different idea. On the whole, it would seem best to retain the simple meaning of the preposition ‘in or within,’ understanding it as indicating the sphere or region within which the communication is made.¹ It would thus call attention principally to the manner or method of converse, and the phrase would be descriptive of that inner revelation communicated—whether directly by God Himself or through the medium of an angel²—to a prophet. The further idea of such revelation being communicated to others will, on this view, be not properly contained in the expression, but suggested only by the context.³ For other explanations of the phrase, cf. Dr., *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel*,

¹ Cf. Marti, *Dodekaproph.* p. 16: ‘es ist auch kaum als *durch*= בִּיד (s. Hag. 1¹) zu fassen, sondern will andeuten, dass die Stimme Jahwes sich im Innern der Propheten kundgab.’

² In Zc. the subject is the ‘Angel,’ not God. This is to be explained by the fact that what was at an earlier time attributed directly to God came at a later time, when the doctrine of the transcendency of God was developed, to be attributed to His angel.

³ In Num. 12⁸ the expression is further defined by the additional phrase פה אל-פה, which would seem to show that the expression ב דבר had come practically to be equivalent to ‘speak with or to,’ though still implying probably more intimate converse than the more usual דבר עם (את) or דבר אל.

p. 274. The LXX. render τί λαλήσει ἐν ἐμοί; Syr. ܣܬܢ ܣܬܠܠ ܝܣܬܢ; Vulg. 'quid dictatur mihi'; Targ. מה יתמלל עמי.

'ומה אשיב וג' [and what (answer) I bring back concerning my plea,' or perhaps, 'to my plea' (אל=על, cf. Is. 46⁸ with Dt. 4³⁹). The usual idiom is השיב פ' דבר: 'to cause some one to return with a word' (cf. 2 S. 24¹³ (= 1 Chr. 21¹²) מה אשיב שלחי דבר; 1 K. 12⁶ להשיב את-העם הזה ד'; and with the omission of דבר, Jb. 13²², 31¹⁴ מה-אשיבנו, 32¹⁴, 33^{5, 32}. Possibly the text here is slightly in error, and we should read, as in the preceding clause, a 3rd pers. sing. ישיב (or ישיבני in accordance with the usual idiom).¹

[על-תוכחתי] Vulg. 'ad arguentem me,' reading perhaps מוכיחתי.

vv. 2-4. Jehovah's answer. The prophet is bidden to inscribe it on tablets, so that all may read; for it is a message the realisation of which lies still in the future.

2. [ובאר] 'and make distinct,' 'plain' (cf. Dt. 27⁸). Besides these two passages the only other instance of the occurrence of the word in Biblical Hebrew is Dt. 1⁵, where it is used in the figurative sense of 'explain' (cf. Aram. באר (*Pa'el*), 'explain,' 'eluci-

¹ So We., Now., Mar., Dr., Hoon., etc.

date'; also the rendering of the Vulg. 'et explanatum,' in the present passage).¹

[על-הלהות] Lit. 'upon the tablets'; *anglicè*, 'upon tablets.' The use of the article is idiomatic. In Hebrew persons or things (hitherto unnamed) are often conceived of as definite just from the part which they fulfil, or (in the case of things) the use to which they are put or for which they are intended (cf. Ex. 17¹⁴ כתב זאת זכרון בפפר; Nu. 5²³; Ju. 4¹³, 7¹³; 1 S. 10¹, 21¹⁰; Is. 7¹⁴.—Dav. *Syn.* § 21 e; Ges.-K. § 126 *q-s*). Ewald, however, explained the article differently; he thought it indicated the public tablets, which were put up in the market, and on which public announcements were made. For this use of the article, cf. Gen. 18⁷, 22⁶; Ex. 2¹⁵; 1 S. 17³, 19¹⁰, etc.—Dav. *Syn.* 21 d; Ges.-K. § 126 *g*.

[למען ירין קורא בו] either subject, 'in order that he who reads it may run,'² so LXX., Vulg., Syr., Targ.; or else an accus. of condition, 'in order that one may run reading it,' viz. as he reads it. In either case the meaning intended is probably the same. For קרא ב, cf. Dt. 17¹⁰; Jer. 36¹³.

3. [כי עוד הזון למר] 'For yet is the vision for the appointed time,' *i.e.* it will be realised in the future

¹ LXX. καὶ σαφῶς. For rendering, cf. Dt. 27⁸, κ. γράψεις . . . πάντα τ. νόμον τοῦτον σαφῶς (= M.T. באר).

² *i.e.* that one may read it readily.

(cf. Dan. 10¹⁴ **כי עור חזון לימים** ; 11^{27, 35} **כי עור קין למועד**). Vulg. 'quia adhuc visus procul,' perhaps punctuating **לְמוֹעֵד**, though this form is nowhere found; **יְמוֹעֵד** occurs twice, but in the sense 'ever since' (cf. Gen. 48¹⁵; Num. 22³⁰). Syr. **ܟܝܥܘܪ ܟܝܢ ܠܡܘܥܕ**, omitting **עור**; Targ. **כי עור חזון נבואתא לזמן**, either omitting **עור** with Syr. or else reading perhaps **יעור** **כי**.

[**ויפח**] Prop. 'puffs for,' *i.e.* pants for (cf. (prob.) Ps. 12⁶). **פוח** = 'breathe,' as **فَاح** in Arabic and **פּוּחַ** in Aramaic. The *Hif'il* prop. = 'exhibit breath' (*Inner Hif'il*), and so 'puff.' The LXX. render **κ. ἀνατελεῖ εἰς πέρας**, which would point to **יפרח** for **יפח** (for **ἀνατέλλειν** as a rendering of **פרח**, cf. Hos. 10¹⁴; Ps. 71⁷, 91⁷; Pr. 11²⁸), and this reading is adopted by We., Now., Oort, Hoon.¹ But there would not appear any sufficient reason for departing from the M.T., which gives a good meaning. **יפח** for **יפית** is probably due to a misunderstanding of the defective writing on the part of the punctuators, or possibly for the sake of assonance with the preceding and following **סֵרֵרִים** (**לְקִין . . . לְמוֹעֵד**).

[**לְקִין**] Cf. Dan. 8¹⁷, 11^{35, 40}.

[**ולא יכזב**] 'will not fail,' 'disappoint,' cf. Is. 58¹¹

¹ The other versions offer only free renderings: Syr. **ܟܝܢ ܠܡܘܥܕ**; Vulg. 'et apparebit in finem' (or possibly free rendering of **יפרח** (LXX.) or reading even **יופיע**); Targ. **כחזקת קצא**.

(of a spring), and (*Nif'al*) Jb. 41¹ תחלתו נכובה. The LXX. render κ. οὐκ εἰς κένον, apparently reading ולא לכּוֹב.

לא יאחר] LXX., Aq., Syr., Vulg. read ולא יאחר (so Oort, Mar.).

4. The verse is difficult. The M.T. עפלה occurs only here,¹ but, if correct, is probably to be connected with עָפַל 'hill,' or 'tumour,' (cf. Ar. عَفَلَ 'a tumour in the vulva or anus'). The root may be conjectured to mean 'to swell,' and then to be used figuratively: 'is puffed up' (lit. 'is swollen'). לא-ישרה prop. 'is not smooth,' *i.e.* 'is not straightforward, upright.' For ישר in an ethical sense, cf. the *Pi'el* in Ps. 9¹⁵, 15²¹. The LXX. read the verse differently; they express εὖν ὑποστειλῆται, οὐκ εὐδοκεῖ ἡ ψυχὴ μου ἐν αὐτῷ. Similarly Aq. ἰδοὺ νωχελευομένου οὐκ εὐθεῖα ἡ ψυχὴ μου ἐν αὐτῷ. These renderings would point to the variant reading לא ישרה נפשי בו (עלה or) הנה עלפה, the LXX. translators understanding הנה to introduce the protasis of a hypothetical clause. There is no need, with Marti, to think that they also read רצתה for ישרה, for ישר is used in the figurative sense of 'be pleasing' (cf. 1 S. 18^{20, 26}; 2 S. 17⁴, etc.), so that they may confusedly and incorrectly have under-

¹ In Nu. 14⁴⁴ we find the expression ויעפלו לעלות, but עפל is here most probably to be regarded as a distinct root and to be connected with the Ar. عَفَلَ 'be heedless,' 'neglect' (*v.* Oxf. Lex. p. 779^b).

stood the word to mean here 'be pleased with.'¹ The reading עלפה (lit. 'is covered,' *i.e.* fainteth), is also supported by a few Hebrew codices, but the meaning would not be very intelligible. The LXX., Aq. have apparently seen in the clause a contrast between the incredulous who weary in waiting for the fulfilment of the vision, and the righteous who wait patiently for it.² But the verse certainly gives the import of the vision. Nearly all modern scholars, however, are of an opinion that M.T. עפלה at least is corrupt, on the ground that a substantive and not a verb is expected, which will stand in contrast to the following וצדיק, and to which בו refers. If this supposition is correct, it is not easy to see what this substantive is. Bredenkamp³ has conjectured הנעלה, but this would not afford a very suitable contrast to וצדיק; while Wellhausen, with greater plausibility, conjectures העל, cf. Syr. כח נחמס (reading עולה for M.T. עפלה) and also the paraphrase of the Targ. 'הא רשעיא אמרין וג'. But it is not at all certain whether this view of the verse is correct, for it is not clear that וצדיק was intended by the writer to stand in contrast to some substantive mentioned in the previous clause. It is not unlikely that the *ו* in וצדיק is simply connective, and that the vision in

¹ This would require a different construction; cf. passages cited.

² Cf. Vulg. 'Ecce qui incredulus est, non erit recta anima ejus in semetipso: justus autem in fide sua vivet.'

³ *St. Krit.*, 1889.

reality is intended to embrace a twofold message.¹ On this view the first clause—‘Behold, his soul is puffed up, is not upright (or even) within him’—will be the answer to the perplexity which the prophet feels in regard to the wide-reaching successes of the Chaldean; and the answer will imply that their pride has blinded them to the purpose which they are intended to fulfil in history, with the result that they will be involved in ruin. While the second clause—‘The righteous by his faithfulness will live’—will be the answer to the prophet’s anxiety as to the future of the righteous. In the threatened judgment, which seems now all but realised, the righteous will survive by virtue of their faithfulness. The first part of the verse, as represented by the M.T., however, is perhaps not in its original form; as compared with cl. *b* it is overloaded. The words לא-ישרה do not seem to add to the meaning of the clause, and it is not improbable that they are an early gloss. They were, perhaps, placed in the margin by a scribe who wished to indicate clearly that עפלה and not the variant עלפה was the correct reading; whence at a later time they crept into the text, and finally also into those texts which retained the variant reading עלפה.

[באמונתו] אמונה prop. means ‘firmness’ (cf. Ar. اَمْسَ)

¹ Though, as the *destiny* of the Chaldean forms a contrast to that of the righteous, it may be rendered ‘but.’

'be secure'), cf. Ex. 17¹² וַיְהִי יָדָיו אֱמוּנָה; and then in an ethical sense 'faithfulness,' 'integrity of character,' cf. Is. 59⁴ וְאִישׁ נִשְׁפָּט בְּאֱמוּנָה; Jer. 5¹; Pr. 12¹⁷, etc. The LXX. render by *πίστις*, which accounts for the use which St. Paul makes of the verse in Rom. 1¹²; Gal. 3¹¹; similarly the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, 10³⁸. The LXX., further, express the 1st pers. sing. of the suffix *ἐκ πίστεώς μου* (= באמונתי); so the Old Lat. 'ex fide mea.' The M.T. אמונתו, however, is supported by the Vulg. 'in fide sua' and Targ. על קשטתון (plu. suff. agreeing with צדיקיא)¹; and the 1st pers. sing. is probably to be explained as a later change due to a different interpretation of the verse. Cf. a similar change in the suffixes in cl. *a* (LXX.).

v. 5. The prophet's commentary, explaining more clearly the character of the Chaldean.

[וְאַף־כִּי הֵיךְ וְנִי] The first clause is quite obscure. According to the M.T. אַף־כִּי may mean either 'also or yea, because,' or 'also it is that,' *i.e.* furthermore (cf. Ez. 23⁴⁰ וְאַף־כִּי תִשְׁלַחנָה לְאֲנָשִׁים). If the text is correct, the latter would appear to be the better rendering: 'Furthermore, wine is a treacherous dealer,' which has been understood to refer to the Chaldean debaucheries (so Ke., Or.); but, as Davidson remarks (*Camb. Bib.* p. 76), 'any reference to Chaldean debaucheries . . . is far-fetched in the

¹ Syr. ܒܫܬܝܬܝܢܐ, omitting the suffix.

extreme, and has no probability.' In fact, the personification of wine is out of place; and the text cannot be right. The versions present divergent renderings. The LXX. (B)—ὁ δὲ κατοιόμενος καταφρονητής (MSS. **A** καὶ καταφρονητής)—do not express אֶף-כִּי, and for הֵיִן they seem to have read some form of הֵן (cf. Dt. 1⁴¹, where the *Hif'il* is used in the sense of 'regard as easy,' 'make light of'). The two following words נִבְרַיָּהִיר are omitted in MS. B, but MSS. **A** Q read ἄνηρ ἀλάζων. The Old Lat. 'Ille vero qui praesumit et contumax est, vir sui jactans,' follows the reading of the LXX. (**A**). The Vulg. 'Et quomodo vinum potantem decipit; sic erit vir superbus,' apparently represents the present consonantal text, 'potantem' being an interpretative addition. The Syr. ܣܚܝܢ ܣܚܝܢ ܣܚܝܢ represents a shorter text, similar to that of the LXX. The versions, it will be seen, do not give any considerable help, and we are thus left to conjecture what the original text was. Wellhausen sees in הֵיִן the interjection הֵי, and believes that v.⁵ commences the series of woes which are contained in v.^{6ff}; while אֶף-כִּי, which is not expressed in LXX. and Syr., he thinks, may be the remnant of a lost verse. A similar view of the verse is taken by Marti, who, however, would insert with Oort הֵן (cf. LXX.). But this conjecture is not very probable, for v.^{6a} is evidently intended to be introductory to the following series of woes; while v.⁵ would appear

to summarise briefly the character of the Chaldean, and prepare, as it were, the way for the following pronouncements. Bredenkamp proposes **וּאִפֹּס כֹּאֵן**, but this, as Nowack points out, would presuppose the connection of v. ^{5a} with v. ⁴, which is not probable, and at the same time it would be unsuitable to what follows. Davidson suggested that the clause read, 'Like wine is the treacherous dealer,' but any reference to wine would be unsupported by the LXX., Old Lat., and Syr. It is not unlikely that the verse began with **הוּא** (the ה having fallen out after the final ה of **יִהְיֶה**), which stood parallel to **הוּא** of cl. *b*, and which was followed by some word or words corresponding in thought to that clause. But even then cl. *a* seems overloaded, and it is not impossible that the clause **נָבַר יִהִיר**, which is omitted in LXX. (B), is a gloss on the word or words which underlie **בִּי הֵיִן בְּנֵי**, and which are now hopelessly lost. Similarly cl. *a*^{*β*} **וְלֹא יִנוּה אֲשֶׁר הִרְחִיב כְּשֹׂאֹל נִפְשׁוּ** seems overcrowded; and it is not improbable that **אֲשֶׁר הָרַ'** also has come into the text from the margin, where it may have originally stood to illustrate the following clause, **וְהוּא כְּמוֹת**. On this view, the original form of the verse may be conjectured to have been somewhat as follows:—

(v. *infra*) **הוּא . . . וְלֹא יִרְוֶה**
וְהוּא כְּמוֹת וְלֹא יִשְׁבַּע
וַיֵּאסֶף אֱלֹהֵי כָל־הַגּוֹיִם
וַיִּקְבֵּן אֱלֹהֵי כָל־הָעַמִּים :

The first part of the verse evidently described the insatiability of the Chaldean.

נבר יהיר [נבר יהיר 'proud,' 'haughty' (cf. Pr. 21²⁴). The verb יהיר does not occur in Biblical Hebrew, but it is found in Aram. (*Ithp.*), where it has the meaning 'be haughty' (cf. also adj. (יהירא); and both the verb and the adj. occur in New Hebrew with a similar meaning.

ננה [ולא יננה] If M.T. is correct, ננה may be conjectured to have some such meaning as 'sit quiet'; but, as no such root is found elsewhere in Hebrew or in any of the cognate languages, it would seem better to regard it as a denominative of ננה in the sense of 'dwell,' 'abide' (cf. Oxf. Lex.), though in this case such a derivation is more than doubtful, as ננה primarily means 'an abode of a shepherd or of the flock,' and it is only used figuratively in poetry and elevated style in the sense of a habitation in general.¹ The text, however, is hardly correct; what we want is really some verb corresponding in thought to ולא ישבע in cl. *b.* The Syr. ܠܐ ܝܪܗ would point to the reading ܠܐ ܝܪܗ, which would form an admirable parallel (so We., Now., GAS.,

¹ Mühlau-Volck (whose etymologies, however, are not always trustworthy) would connect the word with Ar. نوى 'aim at,' which is used (VIII.) in the secondary sense of 'betake oneself to a place of abode'; but against this *v.* Dr. *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel*, p. 124.

Mar.). The LXX. read οὐδὲν μὴ περάνῃ (= 'bring to an end,' 'accomplish'), which is perhaps a free rendering of יָיִת; similarly the Old Lat. 'nihil omnino proficiet.' The Vulg. renders 'et non decorabitur,' regarding נֹה as a parallel form of נָה (cf. Ex. 15²). The Targ. ולא יתקים would support the M.T.

[אֲשֶׁר הִרְחִיב כִּשׁ' נ'] Cf. Is. 5¹⁴. On the clause, *v. supra*. For נַפִּישׁ as seat of appetite, cf. Ps. 17⁹; Pr. 23²; Ec. 2²⁴, 4⁸, 6², etc.

[וְהוּא כְּמוֹת וְלֹא יֵשׁ] 'and he is like Death and is not satisfied,' *i.e.* he is as insatiable as death (cf. the renderings of the LXX. κ. οὗτος ὡς θάνατος οὐκ ἐμπιπλάμενος, and Syr. [ܡܡܬ ܠܡܝܬ ܕܡܪܬ]).

IV

2, 6-20.

A TAUNT-SONG

vv. 6-8. The First Part. The Chaldean's lust for conquest.

[מִשָּׁל יִשְׂאֹו] Cf. Num. 23^{7, 18}, 24^{3, 15, 20, 21, 23}; Jb. 27¹, 29¹.

[וּמְלִיצָה חִידוֹת וְנ'] מְלִיצָה = 'satire.' Only again Pr. 1⁶. The M.T. (*si ver. lect.*) = 'satire (even) pointed sayings with reference to him.' חִידוֹת will be in apposition to מְלִיצָה, explaining more precisely its nature and

meaning. ויאמר may be explained as an individualising singular (cf. Ex. 31¹⁴; Lev. 17¹⁴, 19⁸); but, as there would not appear to be any special reason for this construction here, it would be better, if the present consonantal text is accepted, to punctuate ויאמר (so We., Now.,¹ Mar.). The clause, however, is not very elegant, and it is questionable whether it represents the original text. The combination מליצה חידות is not natural, and what we expect is a verb in place of חידות (perhaps יחודו²?) answering to ישאו, while the following לו יאמר is possibly a corruption of לאמר. The versions render variously: LXX. κ. πρόβλημα εἰς διήγησιν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐροῦσιν; Vulg. 'et loquelam aenigmatum ejus et dicetur'—reading מליצת, or perhaps tacitly taking מלי as a construct! Syr. سَقْلَنْ سَقْلَنْ سَقْلَنْ سَقْلَنْ; Targ. וישועי חודין ימרון ליה ויאמר.

[הוי המרבה לא-לו וג' 'Ah! he that multiplies not his own—how long?' לא-לו (v. *supra* 1⁶). For the aposiopesis after ער-מתי, cf. Ps. 6⁴, 90¹³. The Syr. حَمَلَن لَمَلَل مَلَع, by omitting the following *warw*, connects directly with מכביר. The other versions follow M.T.

[עבטיט 'weight of pledges'—an intensive formation (cf. סגריר 'persistent rain,' Pr. 27¹⁵). The word

¹ Now. proposes as an alternative ויאמר.

² Elsewhere חוד occurs only with cog. accus. חידה.

LXX. οἱ ἐπίβουλοί σου; Vulg. 'lacerantes'; Syr. and Targ. render by the same word (ט, זע).

[למִשָּׁסוֹת] 'for plunder'—an intensive plural, cf. מְחֻמָּסוֹת 'tumult,' Am. 3⁹; מִסְתָּרִים 'a (close) hiding-place,' Ps. 10⁸, 64⁵; בְּרֵכָה '(abundant) blessing,' Ps. 21⁷, etc.—Ges.-K. § 124 *e*. The LXX. εἰς διαρπαγὴν; Syr. ܠܒܘܠ; Vulg. 'in rapinam'; Targ. לַעֲרִי, all express the singular.

8. [יִשְׁלֹךְ] LXX. (B) σκυλεύουσιν, but MSS. \aleph A Q σκυλεύουσίν σε; in MS. B σε has probably dropped out accidentally after the preceding—σιν.

[מִדְמוֹנִי] causal, 'on account of, because of,' etc.—cf. Mic. 2¹²; Is. 53⁵; Ps. 6⁸ עֲשֵׂשָׁה מִכַּעַם עֵינַי; 12⁶ מִשֹּׁד עֵינַיִם מֵאֲנָקָה אֲבִיוֹנִים עֵתָּה אָקוֹם; Jb. 22⁴; *v.* Oxf. Lex. p. 580 *a*.

[וְחִמְסֵי אֶרֶץ נָגַד] The tendency in Hebrew is to avoid the connection of several genitives with one noun in the constr. st., though the reverse is occasionally found, as, for instance, here and in Gen. 14¹⁹; Is. 22⁵ (cf. Ges.-K. § 128 *a*).

[וְכָל-יֹשְׁבֵי בָה] In poetry and elevated style the constr. st. is not unfrequently formed before a preposition as a mere connecting form. This is especially the case when the noun in the constr. st. is a participle (cf. Hos. 14⁸; Is. 24⁶; Nah. 1⁷; Jer. 12⁴; Ps. 2¹² בָּל-חֹסֵי בּוֹ; 107³⁴ יֹשְׁבֵי בָה, etc.—Ges.-K. § 130 *a*).

vv. 9-11. The Second Part. Their selfishness in seeking to strengthen their own resources, and secure themselves against misfortune by plundering other peoples.

9. **בַּזַּע בַּזַּע רַע** Cf. Jer. 6¹³, 8¹⁰ **בַּזַּע בְּלִי בַּזַּע**; Ez. 22²⁷; Pr. 1¹⁹, 15²⁷. In reality the addition of **רַע** is superfluous, for **בַּזַּע** in itself would be sufficient. The root **בַּזַּע** means prop. 'break or cut off' (= Ar. **بَضَعَ** 'amputavit partem rei' (Freytag), and Aram. **בַּזַּע** 'cut off'), but in usage it generally means 'gain by violence or in a wrong way,' as here and in the passages quoted above; and the cognate noun **בַּזַּע** is used in the sense of 'gain acquired by violence and injustice.' Marti thinks that the verse should be composed of four instead of three lines, and sees in **רַע** a trace of the second line which has fallen out of the text, and which he conjectures to be **וְאוֹצֵר הַמָּם**. This conjecture may be right, but the ancient versions support M.T.

'לשׁוֹם בַּמָּרוֹם וְג' Cf. Num. 24²¹; Jer. 49¹⁶; Ob. 4.

מִכַּף-רַע Lit. 'from the palm of,' *i.e.* from the power of (cf. Ju. 6¹⁴; 1 S. 4³; 2 S. 14¹⁶, 19¹⁰; 2 K. 16⁷, etc.). For **רַע** in sense of 'calamity,' 'adversity,' cf. Am. 6³ **רַע יוֹם**; Jer. 42⁶; Ps. 49⁶, 94¹³, etc.

10. **לְבִיתֶךָ ל** expressing a *dat. incommodi* (cf. Ju. 16²; Ps. 59⁴ **הִנֵּה אֲרֻבוּ לְנַפְשִׁי**, 137⁷; Lam. 4¹⁹; *v.* Oxf. Lex. *sub* **ל**, p. 515 *a*).

[קצות-עמים רבים] Acc. to M.T. קצות may be regarded either as standing in apposition to בִּשְׁת: '(even) the cutting off of many nations'; or as an adverbial accus. (in place of the usual construction with ל, cf. 1 S. 14³³; 1 K. 5²³): 'in cutting off many nations.' All the versions, however, express a 2nd pers. sing., and this rather than an infinitive seems to be desiderated by the context. The LXX. συνεπέρας, Vulg. 'concidisti,' read קָצוּת; and so perhaps Syr. ܠܒܐ, Targ. בּוּתָא (probably free renderings). And this punctuation should no doubt be adopted. Gr., Now. read הֶצִיקוֹת, 'thou hast brought into straits' (cf. Is. 7⁶), but the other emendation is the simpler.

[והוטא נפֿשְׁךָ] The construction is difficult. (1) It is usually regarded as a circumstantial clause, 'While thou forfeitest thy soul' (so Ew., Dav., GAS.). With this rendering, however, we should almost certainly require אתָּה to be expressed. It would be better, therefore, if the text is correct (2) to explain the *waw* as an instance of the *waw explicativum*, 'And that forfeiting thy soul,' הוטא being understood as an accus. of condition—'in condition of forfeiting,' etc. Cf. Jer. 15¹³; 2 S. 13²⁰ וַיִּשְׁמָחָה בֵּית אֲבִשְׁלוֹם; 1 K. 7⁷; Ps. 55²⁰ וַיִּשָּׁב קֶרֶם סֵלָה וַיִּשְׁמַע אֵל וַיַּעֲנֵם וַיִּשָּׁב קֶרֶם סֵלָה; Lam. 3²⁶. —Dav. *Syn.* § 136, R. 1; Ges.-K. § 154, note (b).¹ Since, however, the point of cl. *b* is not merely

¹ The meaning is practically the same as in (1), but in point of grammar the two cases should be distinguished.

that he has cut off many nations, but that in cutting off many nations he has forfeited his soul, we should hardly expect the latter to be subordinated to קצות עמים. The participle, in fact, is out of place, and what we want is a perfect (or its equivalent) corresponding to the tenses in the preceding clauses. Accordingly, many scholars prefer to follow Grätz in reading the Infin. Absol. וְהָטָא—the Infin. Absol. continuing the perfects קצות and יעצת (cf. Hag. 1⁶; Zc. 3⁴, 7⁵.—Ges.-K. § 113 *z*).¹ הָטָא has apparently here the meaning 'forfeit'; the root properly means 'to miss the mark,'² and so 'miss' (Jb. 5²⁴; Pr. 8³⁶), or 'forfeit' (cf. Pr. 20² מתעברו חטא נפשו). Some scholars, however, understand חטא to mean here 'involve in guilt'; but there would not appear to be any clear parallel in Hebrew for this use of חטא in the *Qal*; moreover, we should expect, in such a case, the *Hif'il* rather than the *Qal* (cf. Dt. 24⁴; Is. 29²¹ מחטיאי אדם; Ec. 5⁵ אל-תתן את-פִּיךָ לְחַטִּיא את-בִּשְׁרֶךָ).

11. כפִּים] The word does not occur again in O.T., and its meaning is uncertain. The versions render variously: LXX. *κάνθαρος* = 'beetle'; Aq. *μάζα* =

¹ The versions render by a perfect. LXX. *κ. ἐξήμαρπεν ἡ ψυχὴ σου* (reading וְהָטָא), so Old Lat. 'peccavit anima tua,' and similarly the Vulg. Syr. *ܠܡܢܚܝܬܐ ܢܦܫܐ ܕܚܝܬܐ*, but Targ. ועל נפשך חטיתא (a free rendering of M.T.).

² Cf. Arabic *خَطِيَ* II. 'make to miss the mark'; IV. 'miss the mark, miss the way.'

'barley-cake'; Symm. *συνδέσμος οἰκοδομῆς* = 'a rafter of a dwelling'; Theod. *συνδέσμος*; Vulg. paraphrases: 'lignum quod inter juncturas aedificiorum est'; Syr. *ܐܠܬܐܝܬܐ* = 'nail'; Targ. *שפא* = 'splinter'; and the exact meaning of the word was apparently unknown to the early translators. In Mishnic Hebrew a word *בנים* occurs, but it probably means 'a building-stone' or 'brick' (cf. Hoffm. *ZATW.* ii. 1881; Dalman, *Aram.-Neuh. Wörterb.* p. 195 *b*)—a meaning which would be unsuitable in the present context. If the reading is correct, it is better to connect the word with the Aram. root *ܠܒܢ* 'bind' (Syr. *ܠܒܢ* = 'contraxit'), and conjecture the word to mean 'beam,' 'rafter'—lit. 'that which binds together' (cf. the renderings of Symm., Theod., and also the Vulg.).

יעננה] Vulg. 'respondebit'; Syr. *ܥܢܢܐ* do not express the suffix.

vv. 12-14. The Third Part. Their unscrupulousness in establishing a kingdom through the oppression of other peoples. On the genuineness of this section, cf. pp. 38 f.

12. *ברמים*] The plural *רמים*, in contradistinction to the sing. *דם*, denotes blood that is shed (plural of local extension), and then, from the idea of 'blood shed in murder,' it came to be used in the more general sense of any bloody deed (cf. Mic. 3¹⁰.—Ges.-K. § 124 *n*).

[וּבֹנֵה] Perf. with *waw consecutive* continuing the ptcp. בָּנָה, and expressing habit or custom: 'and habitually establishes a city, etc.' (cf. Is. 5⁸, 6².—Ges.-K. § 116*x*; Dr. *Tenses*, § 113 (β)).

[בְּעוֹלָה] LXX. ἐν ἀδικίαις; Old Lat. 'in iniquitatibus'; Targ. בְּנִכְלִין—assimilating to the preceding plural.

13. הֲלֹא הֵנָּה וְנִי] Once again, 2 Chr. 25²⁶ הֲלֹא הֵנָּה וְנִי is often used rhetorically to introduce with some emphasis an affirmation (cf. vv. 6⁷; 1¹²; 1 S. 21¹², 26², etc.), and it is then practically equivalent to הֵנָּה (cf. Jos. 1⁹; Ju. 6¹⁴, where the LXX. render by ἰδοὺ). Here and in 2 Chr. 25²⁶ we find the two combined for the sake of still greater rhetorical effect. The LXX., Vulg., Syr. point הֵנָּה for M.T. הֵנָּה—the הֵנָּה referring to the two following quotations or proverbs. This reading has been adopted by some scholars (Now., Du., etc.), and it may possibly represent the original punctuation.

[מֵאֵת יְהוָה] Idiomatically, 'from with'—expressing origination (cf. Jos. 11²⁰ בִּי מֵאֵת יְהוָה הִיטָה לְחֹק אֶת-לִבָּם; 1 S. 16¹⁴; Ps. 118²³; v. Oxf. Lex. *sub* אֵת, p. 86 *b*).

[וַיִּינְעוּ וְנִי] introducing the predicate, 'Is it not, behold (or are they not) from Jehovah of Hosts, *that*, etc.' (cf. Jer. 51⁵⁸, where the clause occurs again; Is. 29¹⁷ הֲלֹא-עוֹר מֵעַט מוֹעֵד וְשָׁבוּ; Ru. 1¹¹; and with the impf. Ex. 12³; Hos. 10¹⁰.—Dr. *Tenses*, § 125).

[בדִּי־אֵשׁ] Lit. 'for what suffices for,' *i.e.* simply to satisfy the fire (cf. Jer. 51⁵⁸; Nah. 2¹³). ב = *Beth Pretii*, cf. Ex. 34²⁰; Hos. 4⁷; Ps. 106²⁰ (*v. Oxf. Lex.* p. 90 *a*, *sub* ב).

14. [בִּי תִמְלֵא וְ] Cf. Is. 11⁹, of which this passage is perhaps a reminiscence, or else it may be a current proverbial expression: 'The earth is full *with reference to* knowing, etc.' The exact construction (in the case of מִלֵּא) does not occur again; in Is. it is the accus. דָּעָה.

[כַּמִּים יִכְסּוּ עֲלֵיהֶם] In Is. 11⁹ כַּמִּים לִים מִכְסִּים. LXX. ὡς ὑδὼρ κατακαλύψει αὐτούς, reading עליהם or עלימו for עֲלֵיהֶם.

vv. 15-17. The Fourth Part. Their contemptuous treatment of the vanquished nations.

15. [מִסַּפַּח הַמֶּתֶךְ] The text is uncertain. (1) מִסַּפַּח has been taken as a *Piel* ptc. of סַפַּח 'join, attach to,' and explained to mean 'joining thy fury (or poison),' *i.e.* mixing thy fury (or poison) with it (Ke.)—the clause being regarded as defining more precisely the preceding רַעְוָה רַעְוָה. But the expression is peculiar. Elsewhere סַפַּח is used of a person attaching himself to some particular office (cf. 1 S. 21³⁶); or joining a community of persons (cf. 1 S. 26¹⁹; Is. 14¹); or of persons joining or banding themselves into a party (cf. Jb. 30⁷). The term would, therefore, hardly be expected in the present context. It has been

understood (2) in the sense of 'pour out,' and regarded as equivalent to Ar. سَفَحَ = 'pour out' water or blood. Cf. Qur'an 6¹⁴⁶; also (prob.) Heb. ספיה 'growth' (kernels poured out accidentally in harvesting; *v.* Oxf. Lex. p. 705 *b*), and משפח in Is. 5⁷ (=appar. shedding, viz. of blood). But though the phrase 'pouring out thy fury (or poison)' is intelligible, the construction is not altogether natural in the present connection. What is required is a word or combination of words to complete the sense of מִשְׁקָה, and on either of the above interpretations this would at the most be only obscurely expressed. All recent commentators are now agreed that the text is slightly in error, and they follow Grätz and Wellhausen in reading מִסַּף 'from the goblet, etc.,' the final ה having arisen through dittography (so Now., Dav., GAS., Mar., Dr., etc.). The versions render variously: LXX. ἀνατροπή θολερᾷ, apparently regarding מספח as a noun (connecting it probably with ספח 'pour out'), and for חמתך perhaps having in their text חמת, which would indirectly support the reading חמתו (*v. infra*), the suff. ו having accidentally fallen out before the following ואף in the text used by them. Vulg. 'mittens fel suum'; Syr. ܡܝܬܬܐ ܕܚܝܡܐ; Targ. ܡܝܬܬܐ ܕܚܝܡܐ.

[חמתך] The change from the third to the second person in the same clause is harsh. The interchange

of person, however, is not an uncommon feature in Hebrew literature (cf. Is. 22¹⁶; Jer. 29¹⁹; and for a parallel passage, Nah. 2¹⁴—but text dub.), and it may be doubtful (even in an extreme case like this) whether the second person could not stand. The Vulg. 'fel suum,' however, expresses the suffix of the third person; the other versions omit the suffix, yet the LXX., as we have seen (*v. supra*), may indirectly support חמתי, and the latter is read by most modern commentators (We., Gr., Now., GAS., Dav., Mar., Dr.).

[ואף שִׁבַּר] The infin. absol. continuing the participle as in Est. 8⁸ 'אֲשֶׁר נִכְתָּב בְּשֵׁם הַמֶּלֶךְ וְנַחֲתוּם בַּטִּבְעֵת הַמֵּ' cf. Ges.-K. § 113 *k*; Dav. *Syn.* 88 (a). Wellhausen would insert הִשָּׁקָה before וואף שִׁבַּר (so Now.); in that case both infinitives absolute would be used adverbially. The emendation is attractive, but perhaps hardly necessary.

[על-מעוריהם] The plural suffix either agreeing *ad sensum* with the collective רעהו (so Ke.), or else רעהו may be equivalent to the plural רעיהו (cf. 1 S. 14⁴⁸, 30²⁶; Ps. 29¹⁸; Jb. 42¹⁰). The plural suffix יָהּ is, however, very rare (cf. 3¹⁰; Nah. 2⁴; and Ges.-K. § 91 *k* and *l*). The word מעור occurs only here. Wellhausen would read מעריהם (fr. ערה), after Nah. 3⁵ (so Now., Mar.), but this derivation is unnecessary (cf. עירם 'naked or nakedness,' and Ar. عَوْرَة).

16. [מכבוד מן] expressing the comparative; lit. 'away from,' *i.e.* rather than, cf. Ps. 45^s על-בן מוֹשֶׁה; Jb. 7¹⁵, 36²¹; Oxf. Lex. p. 582 *a*.

[והערל] If M.T. is correct, the word will mean 'be regarded as uncircumcised,' *i.e.* become an object of reproach and mockery. The denom. ערל 'regard as foreskin,' *i.e.* uncircumcised, occurs once again in the *Qal*, Lev. 19²³. The LXX.—καρδία σαλεύθητι κ. σείσθητι—have a doublet, neither of which would point to the M.T. הערל. In Zc. 12² σαλεύειν represents the Heb. רעל, and it is not unlikely that הרעל 'reel' is the true reading here (so We., Now., GAS., Mar., Dr., etc.). This reading seems to be favoured both by the Syr. ܠܥܠܝܢܐ and Vulg. 'consopire.'¹ The καρδία of the LXX. is perhaps to be explained with Marti as a false reading of καί. The verb רעל occurs in Biblical Hebrew only in Nah. 2⁴ (*Hof'al*); here we may punctuate either as *Nif'al*, or perhaps better as *Hif'il* (*Inner Hif'il*) or *Hof'al*. For a similar expression, cf. Is. 51^{17, 22}.

ו' [תשוב עליך וג'] 'shall come round unto thee,' cf. Lam. 4²¹ נגם עליך תעבר-כוס וג'; and for the thought, Jer. 25¹⁵, 51⁷.

[וקיקלון] (*si ver. lect.*) 'disgrace'—an intensive formation (*Pilpel*) for קלקלון from קלל ✓ (cf. Aram. קִיקְלָתָא for קִלְקִלָתָא). The Vulg. 'et vomitus ignominiae' has

¹ Similarly Aq. καρώθητι.

resolved the word into קלון (קיא); so A.V. 'shameful spuing' (cf. עבטיט *supra*). The LXX. κ. συγχύθη ἀτιμία; Old Lat. 'et convenit iniuria'; Targ. וית קלנא—all express a verb. This might, of course, be regarded as a free insertion on the translators' part, but the verb which is used strongly suggests that in the text they read there was a corresponding Hebrew word. In this case it is not improbable that the first three consonants of קיקלון are a corruption of this verb, though it is not easy to see now what this word would be.

A different view of the verse has been taken by Wellhausen, Nowack, and Marti. These scholars think that the words קלון מכבוד שבעת, which stand at the beginning of the verse, are not in their original position, and that they should be substituted for the present clause, which is a corruption of them. According to this view the verse will begin with שְׁתָּה גַם-אֶתָּה, and v. ^{16a} will stand in direct contrast to v. ^{15a}. But the clause 'שְׁבַעַת ק' מִבְּ' is found in its present position in all the versions; and though a better contrast is obtained if the verse commences with 'שְׁתָּה גַם וְ', it would be unreasonable to suppose that this was necessarily the intention of the writer. On the contrary, in vv. ⁶⁻¹⁷ a certain symmetry in the method of introducing the punishment which is to befall the Chaldean is noticeable. It is introduced in v. ⁷ by הִלָּא, followed by a causal clause (v. ⁸); in v. ¹⁰ by a perfect, followed by a causal

clause (v.¹¹); in v.¹³ by הִלֵּא, followed, as in v.⁸, by a causal clause (v.¹⁴); in v.¹⁶ by a perfect, followed, as in v.¹¹, by a causal clause (v.¹⁷). This uniformity can scarcely be accidental, and would strongly favour the retention of the words שִׁבְעָה וְנִי in their present position. שִׁבְעָה is to be explained as a perfect of certainty: the prophet states summarily the punishment which will befall the Chaldean; while in what follows he explains how this will come about. Jehovah will make him drink of the same cup that he has handed to other nations. The use of the imvs. שָׂתָה and הָעֵרֶל is thoroughly idiomatic, expressing, as they do, on the one hand the strong assurance of fulfilment, and, on the other, the sympathy of the speaker with it (cf. Is. 37³⁰, 54¹⁰.—Dr. Tenses, § 57; Ges.-K. § 110 e).

17. [יִחִיתֶן] *si ver. lect.* = '(which) scared them away'—the impf. picturing graphically the past (cf. Dr. Tenses, § 27). But we should probably read יִחִיתֶךָ for יִחִיתֶן with all ancient versions (except Vulg. 'deterrebit eos'). יִחִיתֶךָ is for יִחִיתֶךָ—incorrectly formed after the analogy of עָוִי verbs (cf. Ges.-K. § 20 n, and König. i. p. 374).

[מַדְמִי וְנִי] Cf. 2⁸.

vv. 18-19. A 'woe' against idolatry. On this section, cf. p. 39. With most scholars we should most probably transpose vv. 18 and 19.

18. [מה-הועיל וג'] For the thought, cf. I S. 12²¹; Is. 44^{9, 10}, 57¹²; Jer. 2⁸, 16¹⁹.

[כי פסלו] expressing consecution, 'so that,' as not unfrequently after an interrogative clause, cf. Gen. 20⁹; Ex. 3¹¹; Is. 52⁵; Mic. 4⁹; Ps. 8⁵.—Ges.-K. § 166 *b*.¹

[יצרו] In its literal sense יצר usually denotes a worker in clay, a potter (so in Phoen.); but here, and in Is. 44⁹ יצרי פסל, vv. 10, 12, it is used in the wider sense of a graver in wood or stone.

[מסכה] 'molten image' (Dt. 27¹⁵; Ju. 17³⁴, etc.).

[ומורה שֶׁקָר] Only here with reference to an idol; the expression is used of the false prophet in Is. 9¹⁴ ונביא מ' ש' הוא הונב. The LXX. render *φαντασίαν ψευδῆ*; similarly Vulg. 'imaginem falsam.' In מורה they have apparently seen some form of ראה 'see.'

[יצר יצרו] 'the fashioner of its form'; יצר will refer to the form of the image. With the exception of Is. 29¹⁶, where it denotes what is formed by the potter, viz. pottery, it is elsewhere used of what is formed in the mind or heart (as seat of intellect), viz. 'thought,' 'purpose' (cf. Gen. 6⁵, 8²¹, etc.). The

¹ Cf. LXX. *ὅτι ἐγλυψαν αὐτό; ἐπλασεν αὐτὸ χώνευμα κ.τ.λ. ἐγλυψαν* is probably a clerical error for *ἐγλυψεν* (cf. *ἐπλασεν*; but MSS. *א^b Q* *ἐπλασαν*, which is probably a later assimilation to the incorrect reading *ἐγλυψαν*); and for M.T. יִצְרוּ they have punctuated יִצְרִי.

expression here is somewhat tautologous, and it is not unlikely that the three consonants יצר have been accidentally repeated, in which case we should read simply יצרו (so Guthe, Now., Mar.). The versions, however, would appear to express the reading of the M.T. The LXX. render ὅτι πέποιθεν ὁ πλάσας ἐπὶ τ. πλάσμα αὐτοῦ, which is probably a free rendering of the M.T., or possibly they may have read יצר עלי יצר; similarly the Vulg. 'quia speravit in figmento fictor ejus,' pointing יצר and יצר for M.T. יצר and יצר; Syr. ܝܨܪ ܠܥܠܝ ܝܨܪ, pointing as Vulg.; so also Targ. ܝܨܪ ܠܥܠܝ ܝܨܪ.

[אלילים אלמים] Cf. 1 Cor. 12², τ. εἰδωλα τὰ ἄφωνα.

19. [רומם] 'silence.' The word occurs again in Is. 41⁵; La. 3²⁶—in both passages as an adv. accus., 'in silence.' LXX. ὑψώθητι, reading רומם.

[הוא יורה] As a question: 'Shall it teach?' The question is suggested by the tone in which the words are spoken, as is not unfrequently the case in Hebrew (cf. Gen. 27²⁴ זה בני עשו; 1 S. 11¹²; 2 S. 11¹¹, etc.—Ges.-K. § 150 a; Dav. Syn. § 121). The A.V., discarding the Massoretic accentuation, connects the words with the preceding clause: 'Arise, it shall teach'; but this does not yield a good connection with the following words. The LXX. express κ. αὐτό ἐστιν φαντασία, probably reading מורה for יורה (cf. v. 18, and the Syr. ܡܪܝܬܐ).

ת' prop. 'laid hold of,' 'seized,' and then figuratively 'encased,' 'enclosed in.' Cf. a similar use of אחז in *Pîel*, Jb. 26⁹ מאחו בני-כסה. For the accusative after תפוש, cf. Ju. 18¹¹ איש חנור כלי מלחמה; 1 S. 2¹⁸; 1 K. 22¹⁰—the remote object being retained with a passive verb, which governs in the active two objects (cf. Ges.-K. § 121 *d*; Dav. *Syn.* § 80).

אין [וכל-רוח בל-ר] being placed first, for emphasis (cf. Gen. 40⁸; Lev. 22¹³; 1 S. 21²; Cant. 4⁷). In such a case the construct state, having become customary, is usually retained, except where אין stands at the end of a clause (cf. Mic. 7².—Ges.-K. § 152 *o*; Dav. *Syn.* 127 (b)).

v. 20. A transitional verse (cf. p. 39).

הם] hush! silence! Again in Ju. 3¹; Am. 6¹⁰, 8³; Zph. 1⁷; Zc. 2¹⁷; Ne. 8¹¹. LXX. *εὐλαβέσθω* (for rendering, cf. Zph. 1⁷; Zc. 2¹³); Vulg. 'sileat'; Syr. ܘܝܫܘܦܢ מן קדמוהו כל דחלת ארעא; Targ. paraphrases

מפני] Lit. 'from the presence of,' *i.e.* at the presence of, expressing causation, cf. Gen. 45³ נבהלו מפני; Jos. 2⁹; Ju. 5⁵; Nah. 1⁵, etc.—Oxf. Lex. p. 818 *a*.

V

3. THE PRAYER OF HABAKKUK

v. 1. The Title.

1. על־שנינות] The word only occurs once again, Ps. 7¹. Its meaning is uncertain. The later Greek versions—Aq. ἀγνόημα (Ps. 7¹); ἐπὶ ἀγνοημάτων (Hb. 3¹); Symm. ὑπὲρ ἄγνοιας τ. Δαυίδ (Ps. 7¹); ἐπὶ ἀγνοημάτων (Hb. 3¹); Theod. same as Symm. (Ps. 7¹); ὑπὲρ τ. ἐκουσιασμῶν (Hb. 3¹, explained by Jerome as ‘pro voluntariis, et pro his sponte delinquant’; v. Field, *Hexapla*)—have connected the word with שנה or שגג ‘go astray, err’; so also Vulg. ‘pro ignorantibus’ and Targ. בשלותא in present passage. Similarly most of the older commentators have derived it from שנה ‘go astray,’ and rendered ‘dithyrambic or wild, passionate poem,’ such as is characterised by rapid change of emotion and irregular rhythm. Accordingly על־שנינות will mean that the psalm is of this character and is intended to be set to music suitable to such poems. But it has been rightly felt that the two psalms do not altogether correspond to these characteristics, and it is, therefore, doubtful whether this is the right explanation.¹ If the text is correct, it would seem to be more probable to suppose that the

¹ The explanation would be more correct in the case of Hab. 3 than in the case of Ps. 7, which can scarcely be said to bear that character.

term refers not to the *character* of the poem or of the music to which it is to be sung, but to the *change* in tune or melody (*lit.* the wandering from one tune to another) necessitated by a change in the subject and character of the poem. Thus we may conjecture that a different tune would be required for the triumphant description of the theophany (vv. ³⁻¹⁵) from that which would accompany v. ² and vv. ^{16ff}. Similarly in Ps. 7 we have apparently the combination of a prayer for deliverance and a description of the judgment of the nations, which, it may not unnaturally be supposed, would necessitate a change in the tune or melody. This, however, at the most is only a conjecture; and some recent commentators think that, at least in the present passage, the word is corrupt.¹ The LXX. render by *μετὰ ὥδης*, the same word as in v. ¹⁹, and accordingly it is conjectured that נִינֹת should be read here (so Gr., We., Now., etc.). This is possible, but the LXX. on the other hand, not knowing the meaning of the term (in Ps. 7 they render by *ψαλμός* ²), may have surmised that it had the same significance as נִינֹת in v. ¹⁹, and consequently rendered by the same word. The Syr. omits the word both here and in Ps. 7.

v. 2. The Prayer. The psalmist speaks in the name of the community. They have heard what

¹ Cf. Cheyne, *Encyc. Bib.* col. 3946, and Briggs (*Inter. Comm.*) on Ps. 7.

² Unless the title they render was different.

Jehovah has done in the past, and they pray that He would now, in this long period of distress, manifest Himself again on their behalf.

שָׁמַע [שְׁמַעְתִּי שְׁמַעַךְ] prop. 'hearing' (cf. Ps. 18⁴⁵; Jb. 42⁵ לְשָׁמַע אֲוֶן שְׁמַעְתִּי); and then, more frequently, 'what is heard,' 'report' (cf. Gen. 29¹³; Num. 14¹⁵; Dt. 2²⁵; 2 Chr. 9¹, etc.), and so in the present passage 'Thy report.' The rendering 'Thy oracle' or 'Thy message,' which some commentators would assign to the word, and refer to the vision given in 2⁴, has, apart from other objections, no parallel in the O.T., and is against the usage of the word, which, when used in its passive sense and standing in connection with a noun or pronoun, is always followed by a genitive of the object and not subject (cf. examples quoted above and pp. 120 f.).

וְנִפְעַלְךָ [פַּעֲלֶךָ] For פַּעֲלֶךָ in sense of deliverance, redemption, cf. Ps. 44², 77¹³. And for the *casus pendens*, cf. Dav. *Syn.* 106 c; Ges.-K. § 143 b.

בְּקֶרֶב שָׁנִים [בְּקֶרֶב שָׁנִים] The phrase occurs nowhere else, and has been variously explained. (1) It has been supposed that the psalmist looks back to the great event of the Exodus and forward into the future, and prays that Jehovah *now in the midst of years* would manifest Himself as He did then. So We., Dav., Dr. The objection to this is that there is nothing either in the context or in the psalm itself

that would *directly* suggest that the psalmist is specially thinking of the Exodus. (2) Gesenius understood the phrase to mean 'within a few years,' 'within a brief space of time.' It is true that שנה, יום, etc., may be used without the article in the plural to denote an indefinite period of time, long or short as the case may be, as *e.g.* in Gen. 40⁴; 1 S. 29³; Is. 65²⁰; Dn. 11⁶; but the rendering here would be grammatically doubtful, for בקרב does not appear to mean 'within,' *i.e.* after a lapse of, after the interval of, etc., but always 'in the midst of,' 'amidst.' When a Hebrew writer wished to express the idea 'after a lapse of,' he used either ל (cf. Gen. 7⁴, 10, etc.), or more frequently מן (cf. Gen. 4³; Dt. 14²⁸, 15¹), or some phrase compounded with these prepositions (cf. 2 Chr. 21¹⁷, etc.). (3) Keil, who accepts the psalm as an integral part of the book, thinks that שנים refers to the reach of years extending to the מועד or 'appointed time' (2³), and understands the psalmist to pray that Jehovah would not defer His work, but bring it to pass before the appointed time arrives. Apart from the fact that there are good reasons for believing the psalm to have formed no original part of the book, we should almost certainly in this case have expected the psalmist to have written השנים (*i.e.* the years which had to lapse before the appointed time), and not simply the indefinite שנים. On the whole then (4) it seems best to understand the שנים בקרב as referring to the time or period in which the psalmist was

living, the circumstances of which are to be judged from the context. The following clause *ברנו רחם תזכור* shows that it was a time marked by the wrath of Jehovah, that is to say, a time of trouble and distress (cf. v. ¹⁶), while the verse as a whole implies that this had been of long duration, that it was years since Jehovah had last manifested Himself on His people's behalf. In the midst of these years of wrath and distress, then, he prays Jehovah now to revive His work of deliverance and again manifest His power. On this view, however, we are not to suppose that the psalmist looks back, as it were, to the years that have passed and forward to the years of gloom that may lie before him; rather he instinctively feels himself to be amidst years of wrath and distress without any prospect of alleviation, and prays accordingly for the intervention of Jehovah. Davidson's remark that the phrase cannot mean 'amidst years of distress' because the idea of distress must be stated is hardly to the point; for that idea is sufficiently expressed not only by the following clause, but by the context and the general circumstances of the psalm.

[חיהו] Either (1) lit. 'give life to,' *i.e.* call into operation (cf. Jb. 34⁴), or (2) lit. 'restore to life,' *i.e.* revive, renew (cf. *חַיֵּשׁ*, Lam. 5²¹). This metaphorical use of *חיה*, on either view, is without parallel, and it may be doubted whether it represents the original text, or whether some word like *חזהו* 'show it,' should

not rather be read (so Mar.). On the whole clause
 פּעֶלֶךָ בִּקְרֵב שְׁנֵים חִיּוּהוּ, see below.

[תּוֹרִיעַ] M.T. 'make it known.' For the omission of the pron. suffix, cf. Gen. 9²², 18⁷.—Ges.-K. § 117 *f*. The LXX. express ἀναδειχθήσῃ, reading the *Nif'al* תִּיָּרֶעַ, which very probably represents the original punctuation.

[רַחֵם תּוֹכוֹר] For infin. absol. as object, cf. Is. 1¹⁷; Jb. 13³.—Ges.-K. § 113 *d*; Dav. *Syn.* 84 b.

In the above it has been assumed that the M.T. represents the original text; this, however, is by no means clear. The verse, as it stands, seems overloaded. The repetition of בִּקְרֵב שְׁנֵי is not very elegant, and we should have expected perhaps some parallel clause corresponding in thought to clause *a*. Still, it is somewhat difficult to see how the M.T. is exactly to be emended. The present text of the LXX. represents a conflate rendering, and is due to the work of later editors who endeavoured to bring the original translation into closer conformity with the existing Hebrew text. It is not easy, however, to ascertain the original rendering of the LXX.; but on the ground that the more difficult as well as the freer rendering will more likely approximate to the original, we may conclude that the text, as it left the hands of the first translators, represented the following clauses:—Κύριε, εἰσακήκοα τὴν ἀκοήν σου, [καὶ ἐφοβήθην·] Κύριε [MS. B] κατενόησα

τὰ ἔργα σου, [καὶ ἐξέστην.] ἐν μέσῳ δύο ζώων
 [γνωσθήσῃ,] [ἐν τῷ ἐγγίξειν τὰ ἔτη ἐπιγνωσθήσῃ]
 ἐν τῷ παρεῖναι τὸν καιρὸν ἀναδειχθήσῃ ἐν τῷ
 παραχθῆναι τὴν ψυχὴν μου [ἐν ὀργῇ] ἐλέους μνησθήσῃ
 —the words bracketed being probably added later,
 partly as closer renderings of the Hebrew and partly
 to improve the verse. Comparing the text with the
 M.T., we notice certain differences. The LXX.
κατενόησα has no equivalent in the Hebrew, but
 there is little doubt that it represents יִתְּנָה for M.T.
 יִרְאֵת (for *κατανοεῖν* = נִסָּה, cf. Gen. 42⁹; Ex. 2¹¹, 19²¹;
 Nu. 32^{8, 9}; Is. 5¹⁷). MS. **Σ** seems to have preserved
 the M.T. יִהוּה, unless it be a later addition. Δύο
 ζώων (cf. Old Lat. ‘in medio duorum animalium’)
 apparently represents חַיִּים or חַיִּוֹת; while both ἐν τῷ
 παρεῖναι and ἐν τῷ παραχθῆναι rest on a difference
 of punctuation, τὴν ψυχὴν μου being added in the
 latter case in order to provide a subject. When,
 however, the LXX. text was brought into closer
 conformity with the text as represented by M.T., and
 κ. ἐφοβήθη added, then κ. ἐξέστην was inserted to
 balance the clause with clause *a*; similarly γνωσθήσῃ,
 to balance ἀναδειχθήσῃ¹—the intermediate clause
 ἐν τῷ ἐγγίξειν τὰ ἔτη ἐπιγνωσθήσῃ being added as
 an alternative of the preceding ἐν μέσῳ κ.τ.λ, or
 perhaps of the following clause. In the last clause

¹ Or γνωσθήσῃ may indeed be a still earlier rendering of M.T.
 יִיָּהוּה, the consonants (in the text used) representing some form of
 יָהוּה ‘show’ (cf. *supra*).

ἐν ὁργῇ conforms to the M.T. ברנו, and forms a doublet on ἐν τῷ παραχθῆναι τ. ψυχῇ μου. It will be seen, then, that the LXX. for the most part points to the present consonantal text, but with one notable exception: for יראתי they have apparently read ראיתי. This would indicate that in the text used by the translators פִּעֵלךְ was not as in M.T. a *casus pendens*, but the object of ראיתי. The reading has every appearance of being original, and it at once supplies the desired parallel to clause *a*. Though the remaining clauses approximate to the same consonantal text in both M.T. and LXX., it is doubtful whether the clause בִּקְרַב שְׁנִים חִיָּהּ is original. The repetition of בִּקְרַב שְׁנִים is, as we have remarked, inelegant, and the imperative immediately preceding the imperfect, though of course quite possible, is not very natural in the present case, while the use of חִיָּהּ, too, is somewhat peculiar (cf. *supra*). On the whole, it seems best to regard בִּקְרַב שְׁנִים חִי' as standing for an original בִּקְרַב שְׁנִים חוֹיָהּ, and to understand it as an old marginal gloss on תוריע (cf. Now., Mar.), added possibly by a scribe to make it clear that תוריע should be taken as a *Hif'il*, after perhaps יראתי had been corrupted into יראתי. We are accordingly inclined to emend the M.T. to:—

יהוה שְׁמַעְתִּי שְׁמַעַךְ
 ראיתי יהוה פִּעֵלךְ
 בִּקְרַב שְׁנִים תִּזְדָּעַ
 ברנו רחם תזכור:

The other versions follow more or less closely the M.T.

vv. 3-15. The Theophany. God is represented as coming from the south in the storm-cloud in order to rescue His people and anointed one. The theophany probably refers to what Jehovah has done in the past, and gives the substance of what the psalmist has heard. See further, pp. 112 ff.

3^a] Cf. Dt. 33²; Ju. 5⁴.

[תימן] A district probably in the north or north-west of Edom (cf. Ez. 25¹³, where it is mentioned with Dedan, which was south-east of Edom). It is mentioned again in Gen. 36 (P); Am. 1¹² (but passage prob. exilic or post-exilic); Jer. 49^{7, 20}; Ob. 9. Its occurrence elsewhere in the O.T., therefore, is not earlier than Jeremiah, and there are some who would believe the passages in Jer. to be post-exilic. We may not, however, conclude from this that it would not be used at an earlier date. Theod. ἀπὸ νοτίου; Vulg. 'ab Austro'; Syr. ܠܡܝܢ ܡܥ—interpretative renderings.

[קדוש ונ] As a pr. name, 'The Holy One.' From its use as an attribute (cf. Hos. 11⁹), it came from the time of Isaiah (probably under the influence of the *Trisagion*, ch. 6) to be used as a pr. name for Jehovah, especially in the phrase קדוש ישראל, Is. 1⁴, 5^{19, 24}, etc., and very frequently in Is.² (cf. 41^{14, 16, 20});

or in combination with a pron. suffix, Is. 10¹⁷, 49⁷; Hb. 1¹²; and then, finally, without any closer specification, as here and in Is. 40²⁵; Jb. 6¹⁰, etc.

[מהר-פארן] 'The elevated region lying between the wilderness of Kadesh on the north and that of Sinai on the south' (Dav.). LXX. ἐξ ὄρους Φαράν κατασκίου δασέος—κατασκίου 'shaded' and δασέος 'dense (with bushes or boughs)' are doublets on Φαράν, the M.T. פארן being regarded not as a pr. name but as an adjective to הר, which they understood in the sense of 'overgrown with boughs' (cf. פארה 'bough,' Ez. 17⁶, and פאר 'go over the boughs,' Dt. 24²⁰).

[בכסה שמים וג'] The parallel clause shows that הורו and not Jehovah is the subject. For the position of the subject, cf. Dr. *Tenses*, § 208 (4).

[ותהלתו וג'] 'His praise,' *i.e.* that in Him which is an object of praise—here His majesty and grandeur, as seen in the approaching storm (cf. Ex. 15¹¹ נורא תהלות, *i.e.* awe-inspiring in attributes that call for praise). Usually the reference is more precisely to His deeds of deliverance, which demand praise (cf. Ps. 9¹⁵, 35²⁸, 102²², 106², etc.).

4. [ונגה באור תהיה וג'] The verse is not free from difficulty. The M.T. is usually rendered: 'And there is (or was) brightness like the sun-light, rays are (or were) at His hand (or side), and there is (or was) the hiding-place (or veil) of His strength'

(so substantially Ke., Or., Dav.); and the verse is understood to refer to the brightness which accompanied the Divine Appearance and which also formed the veil or hiding-place of His power. But it is not easy to think of the bright splendour (or even the lightning-flashes, as some suppose) as forming the hiding-place of the Divine Power; it would be rather regarded as the manifestation of the latter; and it is, moreover, darkness which forms elsewhere the covering of God's glory and power (cf. Ex. 20²¹; 1 K. 8¹²; Ps. 18^{12, 13}). The M.T. also involves a grammatical difficulty; for ננה is elsewhere masc. and not fem., and we should, accordingly, have expected not תהיה but יהיה. The LXX. κ. φέγγος αὐτοῦ; Old Lat. 'splendor eius'; Vulg. *id.*; Syr. סְרַסְרָס; Targ. וזהור יקריה—all read וְנָנְהוּ. And for M.T. וְשָׁם; LXX. express καὶ ἔθετο; similarly the Old Lat. 'constabilita est,' and Syr. נַסְסַס, which point to וְשָׁם. On the basis of these renderings it has been suggested that we should read וְנָנְהוּ כְּאֹר . . . וְנָנְהוּ כְּאֹר, supposing that some clause answering to clause *b*⁸ has fallen out of the text (so Mar.; Kit. *Bib.*). The word underlying תהיה may actually be יהיה (Dr.) or else some other verb, or perhaps even a noun answering to קרנים, in which case ננהו would be the right punctuation.¹ But these

¹ Cf. Cheyne, who has conjectured חֲנִיתִי; he would also read וְנָנְהוּ כְּאֹר תהיה (?) קרנים מִיָּדוּ. Wellhausen reads קרנים מִיָּדוּ לוֹ, שֵׁם חֲבִיּוֹן עֹהָ, but this is not a very probable line. Cf. Syr. כְּכִנְיָן וְנָנְהוּ כְּכִנְיָן וְנָנְהוּ כְּכִנְיָן.

conjectures still suppose that we are to think of God's majesty and power as a veil or screen, which, as we have said, is not a natural conception ; and, moreover, *וַיִּשַׁם עֹזוֹ חֲבִיּוֹן* would, in that case, be the normal construction. Under these circumstances it is difficult to say what exactly was the original text. There would not appear, however, to be any adequate reason why we should not suppose *קִרְנֵי מִיּוֹד לֹו* to have immediately preceded *וַיִּשַׁם חֲבִיּוֹן עֹזוֹ*, and why we should not accept the M.T. *וַיִּשַׁם וְג'* rather than with some versions *וַיִּשַׁם*. If, as seems probable, the psalmist is picturing the Divine manifestation in the terms of the storm-cloud, then what will be described will be the oncoming storm, rising up out of the south, and gradually extending itself over the sky, and shutting out the daylight. The *קִרְנֵי* (lit. 'horns') will be the rays of sunlight shooting out from behind the dark storm-cloud as it steadily spreads itself over the sky ; and 'there,' viz. where the rays of light shoot forth—the psalmist will be understood to say—'is the concealing' or 'the hiding-place of His power,' which is thus disclosed, as it were, by the rays of light, the latter being viewed no doubt as the radiancy and splendour of the Divine Presence, which in its entirety and perfection is thought of as concealed behind the dark mass of clouds. If this explanation is correct, the *נִנְה כְּאוֹר* (or adopting the reading of the LXX. *נִנְהוּ כְּאוֹר*) will most naturally refer to the *קִרְנֵי* or 'brightness' of

the emanating light; but as this would be somewhat tautological, it would seem better to regard נגה כאור either as the trace of a now lost line or, what appears more probable, as a marginal gloss on קרנים. The M.T., 'brightness as sun-light,' is at least somewhat prosaic, while the conjunction ו, which we miss at the beginning of the other verses, is also noticeable. In this case the reading of the LXX. and other versions (ונגהו כאור) will be a variant, which perhaps arose after the marginal gloss had found its way into the text, in order to make the phrase less prosaic and a more integral part of the description. On the whole, then, we are inclined to believe the original text read:—

תהיה קרנים מירו לו ושם חביון עזה

For the fem. sing. with a dual noun, cf. Mic. 4¹¹ ותהו בציון עינינו.—Dav. *Syn.* § 116; Ges.-K. § 145 *n.* In clause *b* the LXX. read κ. ἔθετο (*v. supra*) ἀγάπησιν κραταὶν ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ, deriving חביון apparently from חבב 'love' (cf. Dt. 33³ and Aram. ܚܒܒ), and κραταὶν and ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ being double renderings of עזה. The Old Lat. has a doublet, 'et illic constabilita est virtus gloriae eius et constituet dilectionem validam' (cf. LXX.).

[קרנים] Lit. 'horns,' *i.e.* rays of light. In this sense קָרָן is only found here, but the denom. קָרַן, 'send out rays,' occurs in Ex. 34^{29, 30, 35}; and in Arabic قَرَن

denotes, among other meanings, the first rays of the sun. Comp. Freytag, *sub* ^{قَرْن}. Some would understand קרנים in the sense of 'lightning-flashes,' but there is no evidence to show that the word was ever used with this meaning.

[מירו] Lit. 'off His hand,' *i.e.* at His side—מן of position, Gen. 2⁸, 6¹⁴, etc.; Oxf. Lex. 578 *b*.

[חבין] 'the concealing' or 'hiding-place of His strength.' The word only occurs here, but the root חבה occurs in Is. 26²⁰ and in the *Nif'al* in Jos. 2¹⁶ (JE) and elsewhere. Its parallel form חבא is of frequent occurrence.

5. [יִלֵךְ דָּבָר] For Šērē shortened to Seghōl in a closed ultima which has lost the tone, cf. Is. 41⁷ and Ges.-K. § 29*f*. LXX. λόγος (= דָּבָר), so Old Lat. 'verbum.'

[וַיֵּצֵא רֶשֶׁף] 'Fire-bolt,' regarded as sending disease and pestilence (cf. Dt. 32²⁴; Ps. 78⁴⁸). The LXX. κ. ἐξελύσεται εἰς πέδια (cf. Old Lat. 'in campos'); a reference to the other passages, in which the word occurs, would point to the conclusion that the word was unknown to the LXX. translators. The other versions also appear to be ignorant of the real meaning of the word: Syr. ^{ܠܚܝܩܐ}; Aq. πτηνόν; Symm. Theod. πετεινόν, perhaps under the influence of Jb. 5⁷ (cf. Dr. *Deuteronomy*, p. 368); Vulg.

‘diabolus.’ The Targ. reads, however, בַּשְׁלֹהֲבִית אִשְׁתָּא. See on רִשָּׁף G. A. Cooke, *North Semitic Inscriptions*, p. 56 f.

[לְרַגְלֵי] Lit. ‘according to His feet,’ *i.e.* wherever He goes, לְ of norm (cf. Gen. 30³⁰; Dt. 33³; 1 S. 25⁴², etc.). The LXX. connect the words with the following clause:—κατὰ πόδας αὐτοῦ ἔστη.

6. [עָמַד וַיִּמְדַּר] M.T. ‘He stood and measured the earth,’ which, if correct, will mean that He stood and scanned the earth with His eyes (so Ros., Hitz.). This reading is supported by the Syr. ܥܡܕܐܝܬܐ and Vulg. ‘mensus est.’ But it is very doubtful whether it is correct, for (1) מִדַּר is nowhere else found in the sense of measuring with the eye, nor does the *Po‘el* occur again; and (2) the parallel clause would lead us to expect not some further description of what He did, but a statement respecting the *effect* of His standing. Delitzsch and Keil, following Gesenius, have suggested that the word should be derived from מִדַּר, which they would regard as equivalent to מוּט ‘move,’ but no such root is found elsewhere, and *in form* it would be more Aramaic than Hebrew. It can scarcely be doubted that the text is in error; the LXX. read ἐσαλεύθη, and this would point to either יִמְאֵן (cf. LXX. Am. 9⁶; Nah. 1⁵—so We., Now.), or possibly וַיִּמְעַר (Mar., Du.), or וַיִּמּוּקֵט (Guthe); and one of these emendations

should certainly be adopted—perhaps the first would be the best.

‘וַיִּתְּרֵם’ [‘and caused nations to start up.’ *Hif’il* only here, but the *Qal* occurs in Jb. 37¹, and the *Pi’el* in Lev. 11²¹. The root is probably to be distinguished from נָתַר (*Hif’il*), ‘loosen.’ The LXX.¹ express διατάκη ἔθνη; Old Lat. ‘defluxerunt’; Vulg. ‘dissolvit gentes’; Syr. ܢܬܪܐܢܐ—all perhaps connecting the word with נָתַר ‘loose,’ and understanding it figuratively in the sense of ‘being undone,’ or else conjecturing the meaning from the context.

‘וַיִּתְּפֹצֵצוּ’ [Either the *Hithpa’el* of פָּצַץ (= Ar. فَتَّس) ‘break,’ ‘shatter,’ cf. Jer. 23²⁰ (*Po’el*), and Jb. 16¹² (*Pilpel*); or perhaps of פָּוֵץ ‘scatter.’

‘וַיִּתְּרֵם’ Cf. Dt. 33¹⁵. LXX. τὰ ὄρη βίᾳ; Old Lat. ‘montes vehementer’—reading probably עו for ער; Vulg., Syr., Targ. as M.T.

‘וַיִּתְּהוּ’ LXX. ἐτάκηνσαν; Old Lat. ‘liquefacti sunt’—probably free renderings of M.T. For גִּבְעוֹת עוֹלָם, cf. Gen. 49²⁶ and passage cited above.

‘וַיִּתְּהוּ’ M.T. ‘His are (or were) goings of old,’ i.e. He goes along, as He went along in the olden time (Ke.). The clause, in this case, may be understood as an ejaculation of the psalmist’s, called forth

¹ In Lev. 11²¹ the LXX. rightly express by πηγῶν.

by the description he has just given of the progress of the theophany. It must, however, be admitted that the line overloads the verse as well as breaks into the connection of v.⁶ and v.⁷; and it is not unlikely that it is a marginal gloss which has crept into the text (so We., Now., Dav., Mar., Du.). Perhaps its original form was אֱמָלוּ or הַלִּיכּוֹת עוֹלָם אֱמָלָלוּ (comp. Gr.).

7. 'תחת און וג' [under trouble I saw the tents of Cushan.] For תחת in sense of 'burdened or weighed down beneath,' cf. Is. 24⁵; Pr. 30^{21, 16}; and for a similar constructed clause, cf. Ex. 5¹⁹ (J); Zc. 4¹⁰. Marti is scarcely right, therefore, when he speaks of the clause as wholly unhebraic. The parallel clause, however, would lead us to expect not the first person, 'I have seen,' but some verb in the third person, corresponding in thought to יִרְנוֹן, and with אֶהְיֶה ב' for its subject. Perhaps Marti is right in reading יִרְאוּ רֵאִיתִי. This would form a suitable parallel to יִרְנוֹן, in which case תחת און may have been added after יִרְאוּ had been corrupted into רֵאִיתִי. All the versions, however, support the present Massoretic text.

[כושן] LXX. Αἰθίοπων. The identification is incorrect; Cushan is 'presumably some neighbouring tribe to Midian' (Dr.).

8. 'הבנהרים וג' [Clause α is difficult. The M.T. reads: 'Is (or was) Jehovah incensed at the rivers, or is (or was)

Thy anger against the rivers, or Thy wrath against the sea?'; and this reading is supported by all the versions. But it is extremely unlikely that such a tautology, as clause α^a and clause α^b presuppose, is original; hence some commentators, following Grätz, would read הַנְּהָרִים for הַנְּהָרִים. This would relieve the tautology, but the clause is still not free from difficulty. The construction "חַרָּה יִי is irregular; elsewhere we have either חַרָּה אֵף, or else חַרָּה לִי or חַרָּה בְּעֵינַי (cf. Gen. 31³⁵, 45⁵). Moreover, the change from the third person to the second, though possible, is nevertheless harsh; while three parallel clauses seem to overload the first half of the verse. For these reasons it is not improbable that one of the two נְהָרִים has come into the text by error; if so, we are naturally led to discard the second and with it the preceding אֵם (cf. Syr. *ܚܪܐܢܐ*, omitting אֵם). This would relieve the verse, and also rectify the construction of חַרָּה.

[כִּי תִרְכַּב עַל־סוּסֶיךָ מִרְכַּבְתִּיךָ וְנִי] Another difficult line. The M.T., 'that Thou ridest (or didst ride) upon Thy horses, (even upon) Thy chariots of strength,' is possible; מִרְכַּבְתִּיךָ will then be in loose apposition to סוּסֶיךָ, and יְשׁוּעָה epexegetical to מִרְכַּבְתִּיךָ. For the latter construction, according to which an abstract noun is found in apposition to a noun with suffix in order to define the latter more precisely, compare Ps. 71⁷; 2 S. 22³³; and further

Ges.-K. § 131 *r*, and Dav. *Syn.* § 29, R. 4. The combination of סוֹסִיךְ מַרְכַּבְתִּיךְ, however, is harsh and uncalled for; the LXX., Vulg., Syr. insert a conjunction, but this is probably due to nothing more than a desire to modify the harshness of the present text. The juxtaposition of the two words might possibly be due to scribal error, and it might be inferred that a scribe, having written סוֹסִיךְ by mistake, corrected it by the addition of the right word מַרְכַּבְתִּיךְ. It seems, however, more probable to suppose that originally there were two clauses rather than one, and this supposition would still more readily commend itself if we are right in conjecturing that the first half of the verse comprised originally not three but two clauses. In this case we must infer that in the original text some verb, answering to תַּרְכַּב, stood before מַרְכַּבְתִּיךְ; what verb this was, however, is not clear. The יְשׁוּעָה may be taken as in apposition to מַרְכַּבְתִּיךְ, but it would seem better to regard it as an adverbial accus., lit. 'in deliverance,' *i.e. anglicè* 'in triumph.'

9. [עֲרִיָּה תַעֲזוֹר] The M.T. (*si ver. lect.*) will mean 'Thy bow is (or was) laid bare in nakedness,' *i.e.* is utterly laid bare. תַּעֲזוֹר will be the *Nif'al* of an otherwise unused root עֲזַר 'be bare,' while עֲרִיָּה, like the infin. absol., will be added to intensify the verbal idea. For this use of an abstract noun as the equivalent of the more common infin. absol., cf. 1 S. 1⁶; Is.

21⁷; Mic. 4⁹, etc.—Ges.-K. § 113 *w*; Dav. *Syn.* § 86, R. 3. The fact that עור does not occur again has led some to doubt the correctness of M.T., but it is probably merely accidental that the verb עור is not found elsewhere, for the derivatives עירם, ערום are of frequent occurrence (cf. also מעוריהם, 2¹⁵). It is, however, doubtful whether the M.T. is right in reading the third person, for the immediate verse would suggest not the third but second person, and it is the latter, moreover, that is read by the LXX. ἐντείνων ἐνέτεινας and Vulg. 'suscitans suscitabis.' In view of this it would seem probable that the present punctuation of the M.T. does not represent what was originally intended, and that we should either read תַּעִיר or תָּעִיר (deriving the word from עיר). Wellhausen would read עוֹרֵר תַּעִירֵר.

[שבעות ממות ונ'] The M.T. is quite unintelligible. The A.V., 'according to the oaths of the tribes, *even thy word*,' is impossible; while the rendering of the R.V., 'the oaths to the tribes were a *sure word*,' and that of the R.Vm., 'sworn were the chastisements of *thy word*,' are really only less so. The crucial word 'sure' in the former and the suffix in the latter rendering are not expressed in the Hebrew, even if the renderings were intelligible in their present context. No satisfactory explanation has been given of the M.T., and most commentators are now agreed that the text is corrupt. It is difficult to see, how-

The word מַטֹּט, which, on either emendation, must be supposed to be used in the sense of 'arrows,' is without parallel; its occurrence in v.¹⁴ cannot be quoted in support of this meaning, for there (*si ver. lect.*) it has not the distinctive meaning of 'arrow,' but must be used in the general sense of 'shafts' or 'staves'; and, if the writer had intended the meaning assigned to the word, it is reasonable to think that he would have used the usual word הֵן as in v.¹¹. Moreover, a clause parallel to נַהֲרוֹת תִּבְקַע אֶרֶץ is certainly to be desiderated. Those who adopt the above emendation, it is true, supply this from v.^{10a}, viz. רֹאךְ יַחֲלוּ הָרִים, but the latter does not form a very natural parallel to נַהֲרוֹת תִּבְקַע אֶרֶץ, and it is much better in its present position at the beginning of another line (cf. Is. 41⁵). On the whole, then, we are inclined to think that the reading found in these Greek codices does not represent the original text but is an interpretative, conjectural rendering. But in this case it is very difficult to suggest any emendation which might be felt to approximate more or less closely to the original. What we seem, however, to require are two clauses, one corresponding to clause β^8 and the other to clause α^a . If this is so, we might perhaps conjecture נִבְעוֹת מַטֹּט for [ת] אִמַּר סֵלָה for תֹּאִיר מִסֵּלָה(?) and נִבְעוֹת מַטֹּט for [ת] אִמַּר סֵלָה, assuming an accidental transposition of מ and ר. For 'תֹּאִיר וְנִבְעוֹת', cf. Ps. 77¹⁷ הָאִירוּ בְּרָקִים תִּבְלֵ. This emendation would involve no serious change in the text, but it

can only be regarded as a mere attempt to improve a text which must otherwise remain quite unintelligible. Accepting then, provisionally, this emendation, the text will have read:—

עריה תעיר קשתך
גבעות מטו
תאיר מסלה
נהרות תבקע ארין:

[נהרות וג 'into rivers'—accus. of the product (cf. 1 K. 11³⁰; Mic. 4¹³; Jb. 28².—Ges.-K. § 117 ii; Dav. Syn. § 76).

וְתִבְקַע] LXX., Old. Lat., Syr. תִּבְקַע very probably the right reading.

10. [ראוך יהילו הרים] For the impf. immediately succeeding a perf. in order to denote the instantaneous manner in which the second action is represented as following the first, cf. Ex. 15^{12, 14}; Ps. 77¹⁷, etc.—Dr. *Tenses*, § 27 (γ); Dav. Syn. § 45, R. 2. The LXX.—ὄψονται κ. ὠδυνήσουσιν λαοί (cf. Old. Lat. 'videbunt te et parturient populi')—apparently read עמים for הרים; but the reading does not suit the context so well as the M.T., and it is probably due to the indistinct writing of the MS. which they used. The future ὄψονται for M.T. ראוך is probably an assimilation to the following ὠδυνήσουσιν. The Targ., Syr., Vulg., with slight variations, support M.T. Compare Ps. 77¹⁷.

[זרם מים עבר] M.T. 'The downpour of waters passed on.' Ps. 77¹⁸, however, which has much in common with the description of these verses, has a reading זָרְמוּ מִים עֲבוֹת = 'the clouds poured forth water.' This would afford a better clause, and may quite well have been the original text (so Now., Mar.). זָרְמוּ would be a *Po'el* denominative from זָרַם (cf. שָׁרַט from שָׁרַץ, and comp. also the *Qal* זֶרְמָתָם in Ps. 90⁵.—Ges.-K. § 55 *b*). The Syr., Vulg., Targ. support M.T.; and so in the main the LXX. σκορπίζων ὕδατα πορείας,¹ who have either read זרה for זרם, or else, the final ם having fallen out in their texts, have connected זר perhaps as a by-form with זרה (cf. Jb. 39¹⁵). The LXX. have, also, punctuated עבר as a noun, viz. עֶבֶר.

[נתן תהום קול] Ps. 77¹⁸ קול נתנו שְׁחָקִים. In the present passage the reference is probably not to the subterranean waters, but to the actual sea (cf. Jb. 38³⁰).

[רום ידיו נשא] M.T. 'on high it (*i.e.* the deep) lifted up its hands.' The text, however, is not free from difficulty. (1) רוֹם in sense of 'on high' is not found elsewhere, the usual form being מָרוֹם; (2) the suff. in יָרִיחוֹ, though found in a few instances (cf. Nah. 2⁴ גְּבוּרִיָּהּ; Jb. 24²³ עֵינֵיהּ.—Ges.-K. § 91 *l*), is anomalous and suspicious; and (3) the other clauses in the description lead us to expect not the same subject as in clause *b*^a, but some other subject corre-

¹ Cf. Old Lat. 'disperges aquas gressu.'

sponding to the latter. Those facts render the text at least suspicious, and it is not unlikely that it is in some way corrupt. If we are right in supposing that the clause is not a continuation of the preceding one, but parallel to it, then we may assume that either under the doubtful רוֹם lies a word corresponding to תהוֹם and introducing the subject of the clause, or else the latter has accidentally fallen out of the text and the suspicious רוֹם is the imperfect representation of a verb. It would not seem improbable that this latter alternative is the correct one, and that the word מִים or perhaps יָמִים (or the sing. יֵם) has fallen out of the text; in this case רוֹם probably stands for an original יְרִימוֹ (or יָרִים). If either מִים or preferably יָמִים be read, then we may suppose further that יִדְהוּ represented originally יִרְיֵה, which was at a later time corrupted into יִדְהוּ after the proper subject had fallen out of the text, and the clause had come to be joined to the preceding line. On this view the נִשָּׂא will be seen, then, not to belong to this verse but to the following clause; and this division is favoured both (1) by the fact that שְׂמִשׁ is, according to the present text, without any verb, and (2) also by the LXX., which express ἐπήρθη ὁ ἥλιος, thus connecting נִשָּׂא with שְׂמִשׁ. The above emendation receives perhaps some support from the LXX. φαντασίας αὐτῆς (cf. Old Lat. 'timoris eius'), which represents the M.T. יִדְהוּ. In 2¹⁸ φαντασία renders מוֹרָה, and it is just possible that in the text which

they used, there stood a somewhat similar group of consonants. If this is actually the case, then we might conclude with some probability that this מ was a trace of the original מים or ימים (or ים), as the case may be. Yet this is by no means conclusive, as in 2¹⁹ the same word *φαντασία* is used also to represent יורה. What, however, is certain is that for the ד in ידיהו the LXX. read ר; but this is a confusion which is of common occurrence, and in the present case there would not appear sufficient reason for doubting the accuracy of the M.T. consonants יד. On the whole, then, we are inclined to believe that the text as it now stands in this clause is corrupt, and to conjecture that the original text expressed more or less closely some such clause as ידיהם [or ידיהו?] ירימו [or ירים] ימים [or מים or ים]. Quite a different emendation, however, has been proposed for this clause. We have already remarked that some would propose to connect the first words of the verse—ראוך יחילו הרים—with the preceding line; and the same scholars would further suppose that this verse (v. ¹⁰) really contains only two lines, viz. זרמו מים עבות נתן תהום קולו. It has been ingeniously conjectured by them that the last clause is to be connected with שמש at the beginning of v. ¹¹, and that it originally represented the words מוֹרַחָה (or מוֹרַחָה נִשְׁתָּח) נִשָּׂה שֶׁמֶשׁ = 'the sun forgets its rising' (so Now., Mar.); but ingenious as this conjecture is, it does not seem a very natural expression,

and it would involve the transference of ראוך יחילו הרים to the preceding verse, which though possible is, as we have seen, not very probable. Moreover, מזרח is never used simply in the sense of 'rising,' but always of the quarter of the heavens or the place where the sun rises.¹

II. 'שמש וג' LXX. ἐπ' ἡρθη ὁ ἥλιος = שֶׁמֶשׁ נִשְׁאָר. So the clause should most probably be read (*v. supra*).

[ירח עמד ובלה] The הַ, which properly denotes *direction towards*, is here used in a weakened sense to denote *rest in* (cf. 1 K. 4¹⁴). Yet compare Ges.-K. § 90*d*, where it is regarded as marking the accus. of direction, the construction being pregnant ('went into the habitation and stood'). The LXX., Old Lat., Vulg., Syr., Targ., however, express a suffix, and it seems best to regard the final ה as suffix of the third person sing. הֵ— rather than as ה *locale*. זָבַל = 'habitation' (cf. 1 K. 8¹³ (= 2 Chr. 6²); Ps. 49¹⁵ (?); Is. 63¹⁵). That the term is an ancient one is shown by the passage in 1 K. 8¹³, which, as the LXX. seems rightly to indicate, was derived from the 'book of Jashar.'

לננה . . . לאור ל = 'in reference to,' *i.e.* in view of, because of, at (cf. v. ¹⁶; Ps. 42⁸, etc.—Oxf. Lex. 514 *b*).

¹ In Kit. *Bib.* יְרוֹם שֶׁמֶשׁ דָּוָם is proposed as an alternative conjecture; but this is hardly probable, for it is not a question of the sun being motionless but of its not shining.

יֵהָלְכוּ] 'at the light of Thy arrows that went'—יֵהָלְכוּ being a relative clause, with the omission of אֲשֶׁר; or perhaps it is a short circumstantial clause, 'as they went' (cf. Ges.-K. § 156 *d*). Marti, however, would treat the sentence as an independent clause, and regard the sun and the moon as the subject of יֵהָלְכוּ. This is possible, but the other construction seems the more probable (cf. the *Hithp.* in Ps. 77¹⁸ אֶף-הִצַּעִיר (יִתְהַלְכוּ)).

12. בּוֹזֵעַם תַּצְעֵר-אֶרֶץ] Cf. Ju. 5⁴; Ps. 68⁸; LXX. ὀλιγώσεις γῆν reading 'תַּצְעֵר-א' (cf. Old Lat. 'diminues terram').

תִּדְרֹשׁ וְ] For this figurative use, cf. Mic. 4¹³; LXX. κατάρξεις, 'break in pieces.'

13. יֵצֵאת וְ] Cf. Ju. 4¹⁴; 2 S. 5²⁴; Ps. 68⁸.

לִישַׁע אֶת-מִשְׁיַח] The reading is certainly incorrect. It is true that there do occur instances in which an abstract noun is used with the force of an infinitive and governs the accusative. Cf. Nu. 10², 23¹⁰(?); Am. 4¹¹; Is. 13¹⁹ (all properly *nomina verbi* with מ—Ges.-K. § 115 *d*; Dav. *Syn.* § 91, R. 3). But these cases do not justify the present use of יֵשַׁע, and, moreover, the *Qal* would be *intransitive*, not *transitive*. The LXX. express τοῦ σῶσαι τ. χριστόν σου, not εἰς σωτηρίαν as in the preceding clause. This would point to an infinitive, and there can be little

doubt that לִישַׁע has accidentally been repeated in the M.T., and that לוֹחֵץ (= לְהוֹשִׁיעַ; cf. Ges.-K. 53 *g*) should be read (so We., Now., Mar., Du.). On the term מִנְשִׁיחַ, comp. p. 129.

‘מחצת ראש וג’] For מוחץ ראש, cf. Ps. 68²², 110⁵; also Ju. 5²⁶. The construction is pregnant: ‘Thou didst smite through or wound the head *and cut it off* from the house,’ etc. (cf. Is. 7⁸; Ps. 89⁴⁰, etc.—Dav. *Syn.* § 101).

‘[ערוֹת יסוֹד ער־צוֹאר] laying bare the foundation unto the neck.’ The Infin. Absol. is used adverbially, describing the manner in which the action denoted by מחצת ראש took place (cf. 1 S. 3¹²; Dt. 9²¹, etc.—Ges.-K. § 113 *h*; Dav. *Syn.* § 87). The form ערוֹת is anomalous; the usual form of the *Pi'el* Infin. Absol. in לִה verbs is עָרָה; cf. בָּלָה, etc. (Ges.-K. § 75 *aa*). The form in נוֹת, however, occurs again in the *Qal* in Is. 22¹³, 40²⁰ (Qr.); Hos. 10⁴ (Ges.-K. § 75 *n*). The LXX. express a second pers. sing., and some would read עָרוֹתָ (cf. Kit. *Bib.*), or perhaps better עָרִיתָ, for the anomalous ערוֹת. If the text of cl. *b* has been correctly preserved in the M.T., the psalmist must be understood to compare the foe to a house ‘the top of which is smitten away from it, so that it falls to pieces, and the foundation is laid bare’ (Dav.). The expression ‘even up to the neck’ will apparently mean ‘up to the top of the walls after their head or roof has been knocked away’ (Dr.). The phrase, however, is some-

what strange, and it is quite possible that Oort and others are right in reading צור for צוּר, *i.e.* even unto the rock, namely, upon which the foundation was built.

14. [נקבת במטיו ונ'] 'Thou didst pierce with his staves the heads of his warriors(?)'. If the text is sound, the meaning will be that the enemy in their confusion and terror mutually destroyed each other. Keil, however, would explain the clause to mean that Jehovah with the staves of *His king* pierces the heads of his warriors. It is true that in v.¹³ we had a reference to 'the anointed,' but to refer the suffix in במטיו to the latter is far-fetched and improbable; and, on either view, what we should expect is rather a reference to what Jehovah directly effected Himself than what He did through the instrumentality of others, more especially as the subject of the clause is Jehovah. There can hardly be any doubt that the text is slightly in error, and that במטיך and not במטיו should be read (Ew., We., Now., Mar., Dr., etc.).¹ The LXX. omit the suffix, but codices 23, 62, 86, 147 express μετὰ δυνάμεώς σου. The Vulg. Syr., however, support the M.T.

[פריו] The word only occurs here, and the exact meaning is unknown. The LXX. render by τ. δυναστῶν, 'the chief men'; Syr. ܐܠܝܫܬܐܝܢ 'rulers';

¹ Hoon. suggests as an alternative במטה (cf. LXX.).

Vulg. 'bellatorum ejus,' 'his warriors'; the Targ. 'גברי רישי משרית ונ'; and some such meaning as warriors or leaders we may conjecture the word to have, if the text is correct. Delitzsch and Keil would connect the word with פרוי 'village-dweller,' and suppose it to have the more general meaning of 'hordes' or 'crowd of people' (cf. A.V., R.V.); but such a connection is doubtful, and, moreover, it would be difficult to see how a word which properly denoted a dweller in the country should come to denote a crowd of hostile people. It is possible that the text may be corrupt.

[עליצתם] Only here (cf. עלין; 1 S. 2¹; Ps. 5¹², 9³, 68⁴, etc.).

[כמו-לאכל ונ] 'is as it were to eat,' etc.; so the M.T. is to be rendered if the text is correct. כמו ל will properly mean 'in the likeness of what with reference to,' etc., but the combination is unparalleled and suspicious; elsewhere it is usually followed directly by the object to which comparison is made, without any intervening preposition (cf. Hos. 7⁴, 8¹²; Ps. 29⁶, etc.). In the present passage it is, of course, possible that the preposition with the infinitive, being of so frequent occurrence, had come to be regarded as practically forming one word, and accordingly it could be the more readily combined with כמו; but the text of this verse is not at all certain, and, there-

fore, it may be doubted whether after all the combination represents an original text. The clauses are not very well balanced, and we miss a line corresponding to cl. α^a ; but it is not clear how the verse should be emended. The versions give no real help. The LXX. express *σεισθήσονται ἐν αὐτῇ διανοίξουσιν χαλινούς αὐτῶν ὡς ἔσθων πτωχὸς λάθρα*, taking יסערו as a passive, either *Nif'al* or more probably *Po'al* יסערו (cf. Hos. 13³), and apparently seeing in להפיצני two words לה and some form of פצה 'open.' What exactly χαλινούς αὐτῶν answered to is not certain. The Greek codices 23, 62, 86, 147 render τοὺς πεποιθότας ἐπὶ τ. αὐθαδείᾳ αὐτῶν ἔνεκεν τοῦ καταφαγεῖν τοὺς πτωχοὺς λάθρα (cf. the Syr. ܠܗܦܝܥܝܢ ܠܗ ܥܡܪܐ ܕܡܝܬܐ ܕܡܝܬܐ ܕܡܝܬܐ ܕܡܝܬܐ, reading at least סער for סער). Aq., Symm., Vulg. follow more closely the M.T. Marti would propose יסערו במין להפיצני עלה צבאם לאכל וג'. This would improve the verse, but the changes, in the absence of any positive evidence, are too extensive to command confidence, and it is better on the whole, until fresh light on the verse is available, simply to regard the existing text as suspicious without hazarding a conjecture.

15. [דרכה בים סוסך] M.T. 'Thou didst tread on the sea with Thy horses.' For the construction, compare Is. 10³⁰; Ps. 3⁵, 108⁷—סוסך being a second subject stating the instrument by which the action denoted by דרכה is actually performed. Some would regard

this second subject as really an accus. of closer definition, but cf. Ges.-K. § 144 *l-n*; Dav. *Syn.* § 109, R. 3. It is usual to regard this and the following clause as stating the final destruction of the foe, the imagery being suggested by the overthrow of Pharaoh and his army at the crossing of the Red Sea, but it has been justly pointed out (cf. Dr. *Cent. Bib.* p. 95) that there is no mention in the verse of the destruction of any foe, and the reference to Jehovah's treading on the sea in the present context is unexpected. The verse as it now stands seems clearly out of place, and some scholars would propose to transfer it and insert it before v. ⁸ (so Now., Dr.; cf. Mar.); but this arrangement, though it finds a not unsuitable context for the verse, is not quite probable. We do not expect any introductory verse to v. ⁸; for the motive for raising the question in v. ^{8a} is sufficiently implied in v. ^{8b}, and the addition of v. ¹⁵ would not be by any means an improvement on the vivid, uncircumstantial description of vv. ^{8ff}. Marti would regard it as a marginal variation on v. ^{8b}. This would be a better proposal, but it seems still better to regard the verse as a continuation of v. ¹⁴, and to seek the error rather within the verse itself than to regard it as wrongly inserted in its present position. The reference to *sea* in v. ^{15a}, which, we have seen, severs its connection with the preceding verses, is probably due to the following clause *חמר מים רבים*, and it is not unlikely that not *בים* but

בם was the original reading; in this case the reference will be to the foe mentioned in v.¹³ and v.¹⁴. The versions, however, support the present M.T.

[חמר מים רבים] The clause is usually rendered 'a heap of many waters,' חמר being regarded as still dependent on ב of the preceding clause (so A.V., R.V., Ke., etc.). The R.Vm. proposes, however, 'surge' for חמר, deriving it from the root חמר, 'ferment, foam up' (= Ar. خَمَرَ 'ferment'), and Wellhausen, followed by Nowack and Driver, proposes to read חמרו, regarding the sentence as an independent clause. If, however, we are right in conjecturing that בם should be read for בים, both the present M.T. and the suggested emendation would be clearly out of place. Now it does not seem improbable that before חמר the preposition ב has accidentally, through the preceding *Kaph* in כוסִיךְ, fallen out of the text. This would meet the difficulty, and, quite apart from the emendation of בים to בם, the insertion of רבים strongly suggests that a comparison was intended. The verse should, accordingly, be rendered: 'Thou didst tread them with Thy horses like the surging of many waters.' Jehovah's horses are the storm-clouds, and the 'surging of many waters' the roar of thunder which accompanied them. The whole picture is intended to describe the fierceness and wrath with which Jehovah is conceived of as subduing Israel's foes. The verse thus emended forms

a good transition to v.¹⁶, in which the psalmist expresses the feeling of awe which is awakened within him as he describes and reflects on Jehovah's vindication of His people in the past.

vv. 16-19^a. The psalmist describes the feeling of awe which 'the report' awakens within him, and expresses his sense of confidence and joy in Jehovah, who, he is assured, will again, amid their present distress, bring His people deliverance.

16. שְׁמַעְתִּי] LXX. ἐφύλαξά μην (= שְׁמַרְתִּי).

וְלִקּוֹל] *i.e.* of the roaring storm which he has just described, and in which Jehovah was conceived of as vanquishing the foe (cf. v.¹⁵).

וְצִלְלוּ שִׁפְתַּי] 'my lips quivered. צִלֵּ only here with reference to lips quivering with terror; elsewhere it refers to the tingling of the ear (cf. 1 S. 3¹¹; 2 K. 21¹²; Jer. 19³). LXX. προσευχῆς, perhaps connecting צִלֵּו with Aram. צִלָּ, ܥܠ, 'to pray,' and ܥܠܐ, 'prayer.'

יִבֵּא רֶקֶב בְּעַצְמִי] Cf. Pr. 12⁴, 14³⁰; LXX. καὶ εἰσῆλθεν τρόμος κ.τ.λ. and Syr. ܝܒܝܐ ܪܩܒܐ ܒܥܥܡܝ.

וְתַחְתִּי אֲרֵנִי] An idiomatic phrase, lit. 'under me I tremble,' *i.e.* I tremble where I stand (cf. Ex. 16²⁹; Ju. 7²¹; 1 S. 14⁹; Zc. 12⁶, etc.). The LXX. express

κ. ὑποκάτωθεν μου ἐταράχθη ἡ ἔξις μου (N^{cb} ἰσχύς), reading a 3rd pers. and taking apparently the letters אִשָּׁר as subject. The Vulg., connecting the clause with the preceding one, also reads a 3rd pers. The Syr. paraphrases ܐܝܫܪܐܝܠ. What the LXX. translators read for M.T. אִשָּׁר is not clear, perhaps as some think,¹ אִשָּׁרִי, or it may indeed be that ἔξις μου is really an earlier (and freer) rendering of תַּחֲתִי, on which ὑποκάτωθεν μου is a doublet; in this case אִשָּׁר will have been omitted by them. The 3rd pers. sing. is adopted by Nestle, Now., and the 3rd plural by Mar., the former emending אִשָּׁר to אִשָּׁרִי, and the latter to אִשָּׁרִי (so Hoon.; Du. אִשָּׁרִי); but compare below.

[אִשָּׁר אָנוּ לְיוֹם וְגו'] The M.T. is very difficult, and the text is almost certainly corrupt. Various renderings have been proposed. (1) The R.V. renders: 'That I should rest in the day of trouble, when it cometh against the people which invadeth him (viz. Israel) in troops.' The objections to this rendering are: (a) עֹלָה would not be an appropriate term to use in reference to the *approach* of a day; nor do we find it elsewhere so used; and (b) we should certainly require the suffix 'it' to be expressed; and (c) there is nothing in the passage to which the suffix in יַגִּדֵנוּ may refer; we are only left to conjecture that it is Israel who is intended.

¹ So Schleusner, Now.

(2) Delitzsch, Ke., Kirkpatrick, R.Vm. (*a* and *b*) render: 'That I am to wait calmly for the day of tribulation for the coming up against the people of him that attacketh it' (cf. A.V., which apparently makes Jehovah subject of לעלות and יגרנו). But (*a*) נוח nowhere else means 'wait calmly for,' and (*b*) the construction 'the coming,' etc., which, if not impossible (cf. perhaps Is. 51¹), is at the least very forced and unnatural. (3) Ew., R.Vm. (*a* and *c*) render: 'That I must wait calmly the day of distress at its coming up against the nation to afflict it.' But apart from the omission of the suffix (*v. sub* (1)), and the meaning it would assign to נוח, the use of the word יגרנו with reference to a day would be isolated and unnatural. No satisfactory rendering, it must be allowed, can be obtained from the present M.T., and the text is no doubt in some error. On the assumption that the text is *approximately* correct, it has been proposed either simply to punctuate יגרני¹ or to read יגרני (cf. LXX. παροικίας μου), and to render: 'That I should rest (waiting calmly) for the day of trouble, when it cometh up against the people who troop upon us' (cf. Dr. *Cent. Bib.* p. 96); but this would not seem really to relieve the difficulties of the text. The use of נוח, unless, indeed, we assume it to be used pregnantly, is, as we have seen, peculiar, and the omission of the suffix is unexpected. Moreover, both this rendering and those stated above

¹ This punctuation is perhaps not necessary (cf. Ges.-K. § 58*k*).

regard the **אִשֶּׁר** as a kind of co-ordinate conjunction, attaching the clause to the preceding and making it indirectly dependent on the **נִשְׁמַעְתִּי**. But such a construction is both awkward and suspicious; it would be better in that case to regard it as causal, 'because I must wait,' etc. Most moderns, however, now regard the **אִשֶּׁר** as corrupt, and take it as subject of the preceding clause (cf. note above); in this case it has been proposed further that either **אַתָּה** (Du.; *Kit. Bib.*) or **אַנְהָם** (We.) should be read for **אֲנֹה**, and either **יְגִרְנִי** or **יִגְרְנוּ** for **יִגְרְנִי**. But these emendations would still leave the doubtful **לַעֲלוֹת לָעַם** untouched, and more may be said in favour of Marti's simpler proposal to read **אֲנֹה לְיוֹם צָרָה לַעֲלוֹת עִם יְגִרְנִי** = 'I will rest in the day of trouble when the people that maketh war upon me, cometh up.' Those who advocate these proposals (including Marti) understand **לְיוֹם צָרָה** as referring to the day of Jehovah's manifestation in judgment. But, as we have already had occasion to point out, this is an exceedingly doubtful interpretation, and there is nothing really in the ode which can be adduced in support of it. On the contrary, the purpose of the theophany, which the poet has just described, was solely for Israel's deliverance. In view of this, 'the day of trouble' can only refer to the distress which Israel is now facing, and to which allusion has already been made in v.¹ (cf. note on **בְּקִרְבִּי**). Accordingly it is simplest to read (with Marti) **אֲנֹה לְיוֹם צָרָה לַעֲלוֹת**

עם יגִרְנִי or עִם יִגְרֵנִי, and to regard the לַעֲלֹת עִם as defining more precisely the יוֹם צָרָה.

It must, however, be admitted that the clause stands in no immediate connection with what has preceded. The אִשֶּׁר, as we have seen, is strange; it may indeed belong, as some believe, to the preceding clause, but even then the transition from v.^{16a} to v.^{16b} is sudden and unexpected. On the whole, it seems reasonable to think that some words, or more—probably two lines—have accidentally fallen out of the text. The missing words would be transitional, and introduce the expression of confidence which it aroused within the psalmist as he reflects on Jehovah's past work for Israel, terrible and awe-inspiring as that work has been. In this case it is not unlikely that the unintelligible אִשֶּׁר may be a trace of the verse, which is now lost. For ל of time, cf. Is. 10³; Hos. 9⁵. The LXX. εἰς λαὸν παροικίας μου apparently represents עִם מְגוּרֵי.

17. [כִּי וְ] 'For *though*,' etc. (cf. Gen. 2^{16, 17}; Jb. 8⁷).

[לֹא-תִפְרָח] M.T. 'does not bud.' LXX. express, however, καρποφορήσει (cf. Old Lat. 'non adferet fructum'), reading תִּפְרָח, which, as the parallel clause would indicate, is probably the original reading (so We., Now., Mar., Dr., Du.). The Vulg. 'non florebit,' Syr. ܠܐ ܬܦܪܚ, follow M.T.

[כחש מעשה-זית] 'the product of the olive dis-appoints.' מעשה with this meaning is only found here, but a somewhat similar use of the word occurs in Is. 32¹⁷ והיה מעשה הצדקה שלום (cf. also עשה אבל in the following clause, and עשה פרי Hos. 9¹⁶, etc.). For כחש, cf. Hos. 9².

[ושרמות לא-עשה אבל] 'and the fields yield no food.' The singular verb is peculiar, but, if the reading is correct, the plural noun must be understood collectively, and construed accordingly with the singular. We should however, in this case, have expected the fem. sing. (cf. Dav. *Syn.* § 116), and it is possible that עשה may be an error for עשת (= עשתה; cf. Du.); but the sing. masc. is found in Is. 16⁸, where we meet with the same construction with שרמות. It would, accordingly, seem unnecessary to read, as some would, עשו for עשה (cf. Du.) or שרה (Now., Mar.). The LXX. can hardly be adduced in support of the latter suggestion, as both here and in Is. 16⁸ they render similarly by τὰ πῆδια.

[גזר ממבלה צאן] 'the flock is cut off from the fold.' The implicit subject of גזר is, as always in such cases, the ptc. הגזר (Gen. 11⁹; Dt. 15², 17⁶; Am. 6¹²; cf. further Dr. *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel*, p. 102 f; Ges.-K. § 144 d). The reading נגזר (We., Now., Mar., Du.) is unnecessary.

[ממבלה] 'fold' = מכלא (cf. Ps. 50⁹, 78⁷⁰). LXX. ἀπὸ βρώσεως perhaps reading a form מאבלה, or else conjecturing that the root was אכל.

[ברפתים] 'stalls'—a ἄπαξ λεγ. The word occurs in the Mishna, and is presupposed by the LXX. in Jo. 1¹⁷; Zc. 2¹⁴ (cf. Nestle, *ZATW.*, 1900, p. 168). LXX. ἐπὶ φάτναις; Vulg. 'in praesepibus'; Syr. ܒܪܦܬܝܢ.

18^b] Cf. Ps. 9¹⁵, 13⁶; אלהי ישעי, Mic. 7⁷; Ps. 18⁴⁷, 25⁵, 27⁹.

19. יהוה אדני חיל Cf. Ps. 18³³ חיל המאזרני חיל.

משה רגלי באילות Cf. Ps. 18³⁴ וישם רגלי וג'.

[ועל-במותי יורכני] Cf. Dt. 32¹³; Am. 4¹³; Mic. 1³; Is. 58¹⁴; Ps. 18³⁴ (= 2 S. 22³⁴); Jb. 9⁸. The LXX. express ἐπὶ τὰ ὑψηλά, and some would read here במות for במותי (Now., Mar.); but cf. Ps. 18³⁴ (just quoted). The י may easily have fallen out in the text used by the LXX. through the following יורכני. The Syr., Vulg., Targ. express the suffix as in M.T.

v. 19^b. The subscription.

[למנצח בנגינות] 'For the director on my stringed instruments.' The suffix, if correct, will refer to the worshipping congregation (cf. Dav. *Cam. Bib.* p. 94; Dr. *Cent. Bib.* p. 99). The LXX. express ἐν τῇ ᾠδῇ αὐτοῦ, in which case the αὐτοῦ, if correct, might be

understood to refer to the precentor. But the subscription is itself strange; we do not expect it after the title already given in v.¹, and there would seem to be little doubt that Nestle is right in conjecturing that the title in the present verse really belonged to the following psalm in the psalm collection from which this ode would appear to have been taken. In this case it is not unlikely that the consonant ' or י, as the case may be, really belonged to the following word with which that psalm began, and was accidentally annexed to the title when the latter was separated from its proper position. The Syr., Vulg., and Targ. paraphrase. For a different view, cf. *Encyc. Bib.* col. 1927; Mar. *Dodekapropheton*, p. 356.

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND INDEX

BIBLIOGRAPHY¹

1838. F. HITZIG, *Die zwölf kleinen Propheten* (4th ed. by H. Steiner, 1881).
1842. F. DELITZSCH, *De Habacuci prophetæ vita atque ætate* (2nd ed.).
1843. F. DELITZSCH, *Der Prophet Habakuk*.
1845. E. HENDERSON, *The Book of the Twelve Minor Prophets*.
1860. J. VON GUMPACH, *Der Prophet Habakuk*.
- E. B. PUSEY, *The Minor Prophets, with a commentary explanatory and practical*.
1861. J. DE GOEJE, in the *Nieuwe Jaarboeken voor wetenschappelijke Theologie*.
1866. C. F. KEIL, *Biblischer Commentar über die zwölf kleinen Propheten* (3rd ed. 1888).
1868. H. EWALD, *Die Propheten des Alten Bundes* (2nd ed.).
1884. B. STADE, in the *Zeitschrift für alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*.
1888. C. VON ORELLI, *Das Buch Ezechiel und die zwölf kleinen Propheten* (3rd ed. 1908).
1890. F. GIESEBRECHT, *Beiträge zur Jesaiakritik*.
1891. H. OORT, in the *Theologisch Tijdschrift*.
1892. J. WELLHAUSEN, *Die kleinen Propheten* (3rd ed. 1898).
- A. F. KIRKPATRICK, *The Doctrine of the Prophets* (3rd ed. 1907).
1893. K. BUDDE, in the *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*.
1894. J. W. ROTHSTEIN, in the *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*.

¹ The list of writings cited includes only the most important commentaries and articles on Habakkuk, and is not intended to be complete.

1895. K. BUDDE, in the *Expositor*.
1896. M. LAUTERBURG, in *Meili's Theologische Zeitschrift aus der Schweiz*.
- A. B. DAVIDSON, *The Books of Nahum, Habakkuk, and Zephaniah*.
1897. W. NOWACK, *Die kleinen Propheten* (2nd ed. 1903).
1898. G. A. SMITH, *The Book of the Twelve Prophets*.
1899. S. R. DRIVER, in *Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible*.
- J. BOEHMER, in the *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift*.
- W. VOLCK, in the *Realencyclopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*.
1900. O. HAPPEL, *Das Buch des Propheten Habakkuk*.
1901. K. BUDDE, in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica*.
1902. W. B. STEVENSON, in the *Expositor*.
- F. T. KELLY, in the *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literature*.
1903. W. R. BETTERIDGE, in the *American Journal of Theology*.
- F. E. PEISER, *Der Prophet Habakuk*.
1904. K. MARTI, *Das Dodekapropheton*.
- A. S. PEAKE, *The Problem of Suffering in the Old Testament*.
- E. G. HIRSCH, in the *Jewish Encyclopaedia*.
- T. K. CHEYNE, *Critica Biblica*.
1906. S. R. DRIVER, *The Minor Prophets* (Cent. Bib. vol. ii.).
- B. DUHM, *Das Buch Habakuk*.
- J. HALÉVY, in the *Revue Sémitique*.
1908. A. VON HOONACKER, *Les douze petits Prophètes*.
- T. K. CHEYNE, in the *Jewish Quarterly Review*.
- F. NICOLARDOT, *La Composition du livre d'Habacuc*.
1910. C. F. KENT, *The Sermons, Epistles, and Apocalypses of Israel's Prophets*.

INDEX

- ALEXANDER THE GREAT, 104.
 Antiochus IV., 102.
 Assyria, 85, 87 ff., 94, 95, 99, 105.
 Assyrian, 11, 44, 45, 74, 79, 82, 86, 87, 89, 94, 95, 98 ff., 104.
 BABYLON, 92.
 Baer and Delitzsch, 153 *n.*, 154.
 Bartatua, 98.
 'Bel and the Dragon,' 64.
 Berosus, 48 *n.*
 Betteridge, 94 ff.
 Boehmer, 9 *n.*
 Breidenkamp, 79, 192.
 Briggs, 114 *n.*, 217 *n.*
 Budde, 21 *n.*, 30, 78 ff., 94, 96, 97, 107, 126 *n.*
 CARCHEMISH, 44 ff., 86, 106.
 Chaldean empire, rise of, 45 ff.
 Chaldeans, *passim*.
 Chisianus Codex, 62.
 Cornill, 79.
 Critical theories, a classification of, 66.
 Cushan, 232.
 Cyrus, 64.
 DAVIDSON, 8 f., 15, 21 *n.*, 22 *n.*, 86, 103, 117 *n.*, 125, 128 *n.*
 Delitzsch, 61, 64 *n.*
 — Frd., 153.
 Dorotheus, 64.
 Driver, 9 *n.*, 15 *n.*, 77, 126 *n.*
 Duhm, 94, 103 ff., 114 *n.*
 EGYPT, 44 ff., 53 ff., 82, 83.
 Egyptians, 80, 104, 106.
 Elam, 80.
 Epiphanius, 64.
 Exodus, 112 ff.
 GIESEBRECHT, 7 *n.*, 10, 69 ff., 78, 107.
 Ginsburg, 153 *n.*
 Goodspeed, 87 *n.*
 Goeje, 65 ff.
 Gumpach, 65 ff.
 HABAKKUK, contents of, 3-5.
 — critical difficulties of, 6-12.
 — *cruæ* of, 12.
 — interpretation of 1²⁻⁴ of, 14-29.
 — editorial work of, 29-32.
 — the answer to the problem of, 32-35.
 — the 'Mashals' of, 35-40.
 — date and circumstances of, 40-61.
 — personal history of the prophet, 61-64.
 — compared with Jeremiah, 59 f.
 — compared with Isaiah, 62 f.
 — the name, 64, 153, 154.
 — prayer of, 108-129.

Halévy, 70 *n.*
 Happel, 94, 100 ff.
 Hebrew, select terms, idioms, constructions:—
 accus. of condition, 176, 189.
 accus. of product, 238.
 adverbial accus., 234.
 article, idiomatic use of, 189.
 ‘Beth pretii,’ 207.
 ‘casus pendens,’ 168, 178.
 circumstantial clause, 184, 203.
 constr. st. before prep., 201.
 ‘Dat. incommodi,’ 202.
 דבר, 186.
 ‘futurum instans,’ 168.
 gen. of specification, 181.
 הלא הנה, 206.
 ל of aim, 180.
 — norm, 168, 230.
 מן, causal, 201.
 — expressing a negative consequence, 181.
 — of comparison, 181, 210.
 — — position, 229.
 משא, meaning of, 149-152.
 ‘Pi‘el privatum,’ 177 *n.*
 plural of local extension, 205.
 רשע, meaning of, 25 ff.
 — note on, 161-163.
 שנינות, note on, 216 f.
 תחת, idiomatic use of, 232, 250.
 ‘waw copulative’ with perfect, 177 f.
 ‘waw explicativum,’ 203.
 Hezekiah, 95.
 Hoonacker, 89 ff.
 ISAIAH, compared with Habakkuk, 62 f.
 — 92, 93, 96, 128 *n.*

JEHOIAHAZ, 54.
 Jehoiakim, 46 ff.
 Jeremiah, contrasted with Habakkuk, 59 f.
 — 44, 46, 52, 59.
 Jerusalem, 87, 95, 97, 98, 128, 129.
 Josephus, 46 ff.
 Josiah, 53, 87, 98, 101.
 Judah, 15, 16, 25, 33, 43, 48 ff., 83 ff., 91, 104 ff.
 KEIL, 61, 114 *n.*
 Kelly, 80 *n.*
 Kent, 80 *n.*
 Kirkpatrick, 112.
 Kittim, 105.
 König, 9 *n.*
 Kuenen, 8, 37.
 LAUTERBURG, 94, 105.
 Lebanon, 43, 86.
 MACEDONIANS, 104.
 Madyas, 98 *n.*
 Manasseh, 98 *n.*
 Marti, 72 *n.*, 73, 76 f., 105, 114 *n.*
 ‘Mashal,’ term explained, 35 f.
 Maspero, 49 *n.*
 McCurdy, 49 *n.*
 Medes, 44, 80, 98, 99, 105.
 Megiddo, 53.
 Merodach-Baladan, 95.
 ‘Mišpat,’ term explained, 24.
 NEBUCHADREZZAR, 45 ff., 83, 86.
 Necho II., 45 ff., 53, 54.
 Nestle, 236, 256, 257.
 Nicolardot, 78, 105 *n.*
 Nineveh, 44 f., 54, 97 ff.
 Nowack, 69, 70, 72, 73 *n.*

OSTRAKINE, 64.

PARAN, 115, 225.

Peake, 69, 70, 88.

Peiser, 94, 97 ff.

Persians, 105.

Prophetic party, 52 f., 58 f.

RIBLAH, 45, 49 *n.*, 54, 86.

Rothstein, 30, 73 *n.*, 91 ff.

SCYTHIANS, 67, 68, 70 *n.*, 87, 88,
98, 99.

Sellin, 79.

Sennacherib, 95, 96.

Smith, H. P., 49 *n.*

— G. A., 80, 126 *n.*

Stade, 37.

Staerk, 70 *n.*

Stevenson, 73 ff.

Syria, 45 ff., 55, 83.

Syrian, 45, 48 ff., 82 ff., 106.

Syro-Ephraimite invasion, 23.

TEMAN, 115, 224.

Temple, 129.

Theory, 'two-oracle,' 67 ff.

— 'fragmentary' or 'compos-
ite,' 73 ff.

— 'reconstructive,' 78 ff.

— 'redactional,' 91 ff.

— 'interpretative,' 94 ff.

'Tikkun Sopherim,' 180.

Torah, term explained, 21 ff.

— 52 f., 58, 87 *n.*, 123.

WELLHAUSEN, 22 *n.*, 34, 69, 70,
126 *n.*



UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY
Los Angeles
This book is DUE on the last date stamped below.

REC'D LD-URL

LD-
URL

JAN 22 1969

JAN 15 1969

REC'D LD-URL

JAN 18 1978

REC'D LD-URL

URL

JAN 21 1986

APR 02 1986

REC'D LD-URL

JAN 15 1987

ms



3 1158 00207 6015

BS
1633
1911

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



AA 000 622 472 9

